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1NC—Capitalism K (1/4)

Space exploration cannot be divorced from its historical purpose as a tool to defeat enemies of capitalism—‘development’ is undertaken merely to open up new ‘free’ markets and expand imperial power

International Communist Current (ICC), “Apollo 11 and the lunar landing: the adventure that wasn’t,” International Communist Current Online, 25 October 2009, <http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2009/10/apollo-11-lunar-landing>

Just over forty years ago, on 20th July 1969, a spacecraft landed on the surface of the moon. Apollo 11 was the first of six lunar landings that were to continue until the Apollo 17 mission in December 1972. The last three missions were cancelled for lack of funds: to this day, Apollo 17 remains the last manned flight beyond Low Earth Orbit.[1] For the millions who watched the moon landing on television, it was undeniably a moment of intense emotion. Who could fail to be touched by the images of Earth seen from the moon, to see the common birthplace of humanity so beautiful and yet so frail in the vast emptiness of space? Who could fail to admire the courage of the astronauts who had accomplished such an exploit? For the first time,humanity had set foot on another heavenly body. Beyond it, other planets, even other solar systems, suddenly seemed almost accessible. The Apollo expedition had made real John Kennedy's words, seven years earlier at Rice University in Houston - words which seemed to open a new epoch of human confidence and expansion, led, needless to say, by the United States with at their head a young, confident and dynamic president: "man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred.The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space (...) We mean to be a part of [the new space era] - we mean to lead it. For the eyes of the world now look into space, to the moon and to the planets beyond, and we have vowed that we shall not see it governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace. We have vowed that we shall not see space filled with weapons of mass destruction, but with instruments of knowledge and understanding (...) Well, space is there (...) and the moon and the planets are there, and new hopes for knowledge and peace are there. And, therefore, as we set sail we ask God's blessing on the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked".[2] Reality was very different. On 20th November 1962,in a private conversation with NASA Administrator James E. Webb, Kennedy declared: "Everything that we do ought to really be tied into getting onto the Moon ahead of the Russians (...) otherwise we shouldn't be spending this kind of money because I'm not that interested in space (...) the only justification for it [the cost] (...) is because we hope to beat them [the Soviet Union] and demonstrate that starting behind, as we did by a couple years, by God, we passed them".[3] Far from opposing "weapons of mass destruction" in space, the Americans had been trying to develop them ever since World War II, with the help in particular of scientists and technicians like Werner von Braun who had taken part in the German war effort.[4] During the 1950s, the RAND Corporation and others developed a whole panoply of ideas on nuclear dissuasion, and the means to counter-attack with nuclear weapons in the case of an enemy first strike (one rather fantastic proposal presented by Boeing in 1959 even envisaged the construction of missile launch sites on the moon![5]). Kennedy's words of "peace" were thus perfectly hypocritical, and could barely hide the fright caused to the American ruling class - and spread throughout the population by its propaganda - first by the launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the inability of the US Army to match it,[6]then by the Russian cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin's successful first manned spaceflight. The shock caused by Sputnik was all the greater in that the US had thought themselves to be leading in the development of missiles and space weaponry. On the contrary, the USSR seemed to have overtaken the United States in missile technology, above all in the technology of ICBMs which would be capable of striking directly at US territory. In January 1958, Hugh Dryden, director of the NACA (National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics) published a report on A National Research Program for Space Technology, in which he declared: "It is of great urgency and importance to our country both from consideration of our prestige as a nation as well as military necessity that this challenge [Sputnik] be met by an energetic program of research and development for the conquest of space...".[7] The result was the transformation, in 1958, of the NACA - a commission established during World War I essentially with the aim of developing military aviation - into the NASA, whose budget was literally to explode: from a NACA budget of a mere $100 million in 1957, the NASA was to swallow up $25 billion in the Apollo programme alone.

<card continues>
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<card continued>

However, the fundamental reason for undertaking the Apollo programme was not directly military: the enormous Saturn V launchers were not adapted to carry ballistic missiles, while the launch bases were too vast and too exposed to be of use in wartime. On the contrary, the Apollo programme consciously diverted major funds from more explicitly military ICBM programmes. In 1961, the Weisner report prepared for the incoming president insisted that the main reason for the space effort should be "...the factor of national prestige. Space exploration and exploits have captured the imagination of the peoples of the world. During the next few years the prestige of the United States will in part be determined by the leadership we demonstrate in space activities".[8] For Kennedy, this factor of prestige certainly came first. Presenting his government to a joint session of Congress on 25th May 1961, Kennedy clearly placed the space programme in the context of the imperialist rivalry between the USA and the USSR and the period of decolonisation by the old European empires: "The great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe - Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East - the lands of the rising peoples. Their revolution is the greatest in human history. They seek an end to injustice, tyranny, and exploitation (...) theirs is a revolution which we would support regardless (...) of which political or economic route they should choose to freedom. For the adversaries of freedom [by implication, the USSR] did not create the revolution; nor did they create the conditions which compel it. But they are seeking to ride the crest of its wave - to capture it for themselves. Yet their aggression is more often concealed than open".[9]In other words, the old empires (above all the French and British empires) have created a catastrophic situation in which national "revolutions" are likely to fall into the Soviet camp, not because they are conquered militarily but because the USSR represents a more attractive option for the new local bourgeois cliques emerging from the process of decolonisation. In this context, Kennedy put forward a whole series of measures for strengthening the US military, increasing military and civilian aid to friendly governments, etc. At the end of his speech came the Apollo programme: "Finally, if we are to win the battle that is now going on around the world between freedom and tyranny, the dramatic achievements in space which occurred in recent weeks should have made clear to us all, as did the Sputnik in 1957, the impact of this adventure on the minds of men everywhere, who are attempting to make a determination of which road they should take (...) No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind [than sending a man to the moon]" (ibid). Just like the "civilising mission" of the European colonial powers in the 19th century, the US commitment to this great "adventure for freedom" came with a big dose of hypocrisy: it certainly served as a mask to hide America's real imperialist aims in its struggle against the USSR for domination of the planet. In this sense, the real target of the Apollo 11 mission was not on the moon, but on Earth.

1NC—Capitalism K (3/4)

The imperialist logic of capital makes nuclear war and environmental destruction inevitable

John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, "Naked Imperialism," Monthly Review, Vol. 57 No. 4, 2005

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.
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Vote negative as an act of enmity against capital.

Our methodology is a precursor to all action—failing to declare war on capitalism makes progressive praxis bankrupt and stifles radical action.

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg. 127-128.

Virno does recognize the danger that a politics predicated upon Exodus, by downgrading the “absolute enmity” implicit in the traditional Marxist assumption that class struggle in its revolutionary form issues in civil war, leads to the assumption that one is “swimming with the current” or is be­ing driven “irresistibly forward” (1996, 203). A politics aimed at the estab­lishment of liberated zones within capitalism under the assumption that the state will wither away without actually being “smashed” leads to the problematic one sees over and over again in postmodern cultural studies: “doing what comes naturally” as radical praxis. To counter this, Virno re­defines the “unlimitedly reactive” “enmity” of the “Multitude” in terms of the “right to resistance” (206): What deserve to be defended at all costs are the works of “friendship.” Vio­lence is not geared to visions of some hypothetical tomorrow, but functions to ensure respect and a continued existence for things that were mapped out yesterday. It does not innovate, but acts to prolong things that are already there: the autonomous expressions of “acting-in-concert” that arise out of general intellect, organisms of non-representative democracy, forms of mu­tual protection and assistance (welfare, in short) that have emerged outside of and against the realm of State Administration. In other words, what we have here is a violence that is conservational (206). The decisiveness of the question of absolute enmity becomes clear if we ask a rather obvious question: What distinguishes autonomous expres­sions from any privatized space (say, Internet chat rooms) that withdraws from the common in the name of friendships, mutual aid, or, for that mat­ter, networks, gated communities, or whatever? In short, nothing can lead more directly to the death of revolutionary politics than the assumption that the days of absolute enmity are over. Autonomous expressions neces­sarily lead to the esoteric and the singular as the paths of least resistance. Therefore (as in all Left-Nietzscheanisms), they take as their main enemy the programmatic and the decidable, transforming liberation into a pri­vate, simulacral affair, regardless of their denunciations of capitalism. I will return to this issue in the next two chapters, but I want to conclude this discussion by stressing that only theory and action that establish spaces that bring the common out into the open—beforean outside (theory and judgment) so as to make visible the concentrated political-economic force of the ruling class—can count as a genuinely “new” politics.

Link: Space Exploration (1/2)

Even ‘peaceful’ space exploration efforts cannot be divorced from their imperial intentions—the drive to expand humanity further into space is simply emblematic of the capitalist necessity for growth, no matter the social cost.

John Parrington, “Dark side of the moon,” Socialit Review, Issue 232, July/August 1999, <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/sr232/contents.htm>

No one likes being deceived. One of the distressing features of coming to terms with the reality of capitalist society is learning that events which inspired us as children were based on quite different motives than we perceived at the time. Thirty years ago this month, on 20 July 1969, a human being stood on the surface of the moon for the very first time. I cannot have been the only child who truly believed Neil Armstrong when he stepped out from the lunar lander and uttered those famous words, 'One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.' The drive to discover and explore the natural world is surely one of humanity's endearing attributes. Who but a total cynic could not be moved by the beauty of our solar system as it has unfolded over the past few decades? Whether it is the awesome volcanoes and canyons of Mars, the boiling hell of Venus, the aquamarine beauty of the blue gas giant Uranus or its strange, scrambled moon, Miranda, it is hard to know whether to class these images as science or art. Yet space exploration has been inextricably bound up with another rather more sinister tendency the drive within capitalism towards war. The pioneering efforts in rocketry of characters like the American Robert H Goddard were largely ignored or ridiculed by the establishment. What helped to change this attitude was the very practical wartime demonstration, by the German V-2 missile, that rockets could be powerful weapons of mass destruction. After the war everyone wanted to be friends with the V-2's architect, Wernher von Braun. The fact that the missiles had left 2,770 Britons dead and 21,000 wounded made any advances that the British government would have liked to have made towards von Braun and his team a little awkward. In any case, the US had the money, and for the next 20 years von Braun was at the centre of the US space effort. He designed the Saturn V rocket which carried the astronauts to the moon. The link between space exploration and military aims did not disappear after the war. In one of the first interviews given in the US in 1945, von Braun envisaged an orbiting rocket, a primary task of which would be the observation of 'troop movements' on the earth below. In 1946 a highly confidential US government report drew attention to the 'great military value, of satellites. It also suggested that this potential be deliberately underplayed, the emphasis being put instead on the peaceful uses of this 'remarkable technological advance'. At the height of the Cold War the announcement, in 1954, of plans for an International Geophysics Year seemed heaven sent. Every country in the world was invited to try its hand at launching a research satellite during 1957-58. What a perfect cover! In 1955 President Eisenhower approved the secret plans for the first US spy satellite. It seemed certain that the US would be making all the running in the race into space. What no one expected was that the Russians might get there first. The successful launch of the Russian Sputnik satellite on 4 October 1957 sent a tremor through the US establishment. The Russians were supposed to be a race of backward farmers, whose country's technology was being stretched to the limit just keeping their tractors running. And yet here they were launching a 183 pound satellite into space, while the US was still struggling to get a five pound one off the ground. Democrat Lyndon B Johnson was one US politician willing to provide a voice for the hysteria which swept the US caused by the launch of Sputnik. Johnson talked of how the sky above his Texas ranch was now full of ominous question marks: 'I don't want to go to sleep by a Communist moon.' In the midst of his tirades Johnson let slip the real reasons behind the space race: 'If, out in space, there is the ultimate position--from which total control of the earth may be exercised--then our national goal... must be to win and hold that position.' In the context of the Cold War, civilian and military goals had become intertwined. The conquest of space had now become a crucial psychological test. An ostensibly civilian space agency would also provide very useful cover for the development of new intercontinental rocket systems and spy satellites. So it was that Nasa was born in 1958. Things had still to go the US's way, however. In 1961 Russia again pipped the US to the post, sending the first man, Yuri Gagarin, into orbit. Only one goal seemed to be left. In May 1961, in the wake of the Bay of Pigs debacle, President Kennedy vowed that the US would put a man on the moon within the decade.

<card continues>
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<card continued>

The lunar landings still stand as a measure of humankind's technological achievements. From a scientific point of view, however, they were of extremely limited value. Such, at least, was the view of geophysicists at the prestigious Carnegie Institute, who voted their disapproval of the Apollo programme by 110 to three. What was perhaps most surprising was how quickly the excitement over the lunar landing dissipated. By the time the astronauts made their successful return to earth, interest was already beginning to wane. One factor in this was that there were other, more terrestrial distractions. The Vietnam War was, after all, in full swing. The irony was that the whole point of the moon landing had been to demonstrate the US's overwhelming technological superiority. And yet here it was being trounced by a tiny Third World country. The writer Norman Mailer could not make up his mind as to whether the lunar project was 'the noblest expression of the 20th century or the quintessential statement of our fundamental insanity'. Mailer had identified the contradiction at the heart of capitalism itself. On the one hand, the collective inspiration and ingenuity of human beings making possible a voyage into the heavens that would have truly astounded past generations. On the other hand, a system that uses such events as a cover for developing ever more powerful weapons of destruction.

Link: Space Exploration/Resources

Space represents the new ‘outside’ for capitalism, a new frontier to be gutted for the sake of sustained profit margins. Projects for exploration and resource extraction only permit continued exploitation and enslavement of the working class on Earth.

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Instead of indulging in over-optimistic and fantastic visions, we should take a longer, harder, and more critical look at what is happening and what is likely to happen. We can then begin taking a more measured view of space humanization, and start developing more progressive alternatives. At this point, we must return to the deeper, underlying processes which are at the heart of the capitalist economy and society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar. In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that an “outside” to capitalism is important for two main reasons. First, it is needed as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.[7](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en79) As outlined earlier, space technology has extended and deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to the further expansion of global capitalism. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power.[8](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en78) But expansion into the cosmos does offer prospects for exploiting new materials such as those in asteroids, the moon, and perhaps other cosmic entities such as Mars. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. The reproduction of material life is wholly dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum are immune from transformation by capital.[9](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en77) Capital is now also “stalking” outer space in the search for new resources and raw materials. Nature on a cosmic scale now seems likely to be incorporated into production processes, these being located mainly on earth. Since Luxemburg wrote, an increasing number of political economists have argued that the importance of a capitalist “outside” is not so much that of creating a new pool of customers or of finding new resources.[10](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en76) Rather, an outside is needed as a zone into which surplus capital can be invested. Economic and social crisis stems less from the problem of finding new consumers, and more from that of finding, making, and exploiting zones of profitability for surplus capital. Developing “outsides” in this way is also a product of recurring crises, particularly those of declining economic profitability. These crises are followed by attempted “fixes” in distinct geographic regions. The word “fix” is used here both literally and figuratively. On the one hand, capital is being physically invested in new regions. On the other hand, the attempt is to fix capitalism’s crises. Regarding the latter, however, there are, of course, no absolute guarantees that such fixes will really correct an essentially unstable social and economic system. At best, they are short-term solutions. The kind of theory mentioned above also has clear implications for the humanization of the cosmos. Projects for the colonization of outer space should be seen as the attempt to make new types of “spatial fix,” again in response to economic, social, and environmental crises on earth. Outer space will be “globalized,” i.e., appended to Earth, with new parts of the cosmos being invested in by competing nations and companies. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. Some influential commentators argue that the current problem for capitalism is that there is now no “outside.”[11](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en75) Capitalism is everywhere. Similarly, resistance to capitalism is either everywhere or nowhere. But, as suggested above, the humanization of the cosmos seriously questions these assertions. New “spatial fixes” are due to be opened up in the cosmos, capitalism’s emergent outside. At first, these will include artificial fixes such as satellites, space stations, and space hotels. But during the next twenty years or so, existing outsides, such as the moon and Mars, will begin attracting investments. The stage would then be set for wars in outer space between nations and companies attempting to make their own cosmic “fixes.”

Link: Space Industry/Tourism

The privatization of space exploration reveals the insidious capitalist elements at work in developing outer space—this centralizes economic and political power into the hands of the military-industrial complex.

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

What evidence is there that economic, social, and environmental crises lie behind the growing humanization of the cosmos? One indication is that, between 2004 and 2009, the global space economy (this including commercial satellites, military hardware, space tourism infrastructure costs, and launch services) increased by 40 percent.[12](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en74) So, while the global economic crisis starting in 2008 has been grabbing the headlines, the sectors involved in the outer space economy have experienced very rapid growth. In 2009 space industry and government budgets involved in outer space rose by 7 percent to $261.61 billion. A 2010 survey of the global outer space economy puts this as follows: “amidst a widespread international economic crisis, the space industry proved resilient, demonstrating growth and expansion into 2010. While several other leading industries suffered dramatically, and many governments struggled to remain fiscally viable, the space industry defied the upheaval and broadened its fields of endeavour.”[13](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en73) All this suggests not just that the outer space economy is doing well while other sectors are doing less well, but that growing investment in the solar system is a response to global economic crisis. Again, this growth of the private space economy underlines the significance of President Obama’s shift toward private sector “solutions” to space humanization. The private sector has long argued that, in terms of creating technological innovation and reducing costs, it is superior to NASA and other government agencies. Now—and, it should be noted, with extensive earlier financial backing from NASA—it is advancing itself as capable of taking over large parts of the space program. But, at the same time, restructuring within the space industry is following some very familiar lines. Close links and mergers are taking place between large monopolistic companies and the smaller enterprises celebrated by the Space Renaissance Initiative. For example, Northrop-Grumman, one of the leading U.S. defense manufacturers, has recently bought Scaled Composites, the latter having pioneered lightweight materials used for space tourism vehicles. Northrop-Grumman has for many years designed and constructed satellite-guided drones used in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. This merger raises the prospect of skills and technologies originally designed to take wealthy people into outer space being developed to observe and eliminate warlords—and others—back on earth. Space-X is another relatively small space tourism company. It was founded in 2002 by Elon Musk, a cofounder of PayPal. But this small enterprise is now rapidly growing as a result of a number of contracts from the American Airforce. Launch services provided to the USAF by Space-X are resulting in contracts worth up to $1 billion. Other links, this time between big and small capital, are also developing. Bob Bigelow, for example, has long been an important but small-scale contender in the outer space tourism business. His proposals have included hotels on the moon and in other parts of outer space. He has already constructed 1:3-scale working models of these projects. Now, his company is in close partnership with Boeing, the exceptionally large aerospace company. Together, they will supply the space taxis outlined by President Obama. They will take astronauts and scientists to the International Space Station. Bigelow declares himself very enthusiastic as “part of the Boeing team”: “We’re very excited about this program and the Boeing partnership in general. Boeing brings with it unparalleled experience and expertise in human spaceflight systems, which will be combined with Bigelow’s Aerospace’s entrepreneurial spirit and cost conscious practices.”[14](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en72) But another, more downbeat, assessment is that the individualistic, entrepreneurial spirit endorsed by the Space Renaissance Initiative is, in practice, being co-opted into the military-industrial complex.

Link: Space Law

The central purpose of legal norms in outer space is to ensure private property has a safe new terrain upon which to expand—this enables continued commodification and alienation

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Given the increased emphasis on the commercialization of outer space, it comes as no surprise to find the question of private property in outer space opened up for debate. If capital is to undertake a space program and commodify nearby parts of the solar system, it needs reassurance that its investments will be protected by law. The issue is now being highlighted by an argument over the geostationary orbit (GEO). This is the 30 km-wide strip 35,786 km above the equator, one in which satellites can orbit at the same speed as the ground below them. With only three satellites in the GEO, a media conglomerate, a communications company, or a government surveillance agency can cover the whole world. No wonder it has been called “space’s most valuable real estate.”[15](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en71) This raises the urgent question, one still not adequately resolved, of who actually owns this area of outer space. Is it owned by the equatorial countries such as Colombia, Indonesia, and Kenya under this strip? Or is it jointly owned and managed by all states? The debate over the GEO is a microcosm of that concerning outer space as a whole. The present position is one in which the moon and other celestial bodies cannot be legally owned. Under Article II of the 1967 United Nations Outer Space Treaty, the whole of outer space “is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”[16](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en70) It seems clear that the intention here was to prevent ownership and commodification of outer space. But this is now being challenged. Mirroring the perspective of the Space Renaissance Initiative, lawyers promoting the extension of the private sector into outer space argue that the framers of the UN Outer Space Treaty “were deliberately ambiguous about private property as opposed to nationally owned property.”[17](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en69) “Besides helping to ensure the survival of mankind,” these lawyers argue, “the settling of space—including the establishment of permanent settlements on the Moon and Mars—will bring incalculable economic and social benefits to all nations.”[18](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en68) Sufficient profits must be guaranteed, and this can only be done by ensuring property rights in space. Future outer space treaties should, according to one group of space lawyers, allow private ownership of a circle of land about 437 miles around an initial base. This means the reward for ensuring the future of humankind would be about six hundred thousand square miles of cosmic real estate, approximately the size of Alaska.

Link: Satellites

Satellite observation is a key tool of capitalist domination, allowing for complete military control of social life to ensure efficient distribution of production

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Yet among these plans and proposals, it is easy to forget that outer space is already being increasingly humanized. It has now been made an integral part of the way global capitalist society is organized and extended. Satellites, for example, are extremely important elements of contemporary communications systems. These have enabled an increasing number of people to become part of the labor market. Teleworking is the best known example. Satellite-based communications have also facilitated new forms of consumption such as teleshopping. Without satellite-based communications, the global economy in its present form would grind to a halt.

Satellites have also been made central to modern warfare. Combined with pilotless Predator drones, they are now being used to observe and attack Taliban and Al-Qaida operatives in Afghanistan and elsewhere. This action is done by remote control from Creech Air Force Base at Indian Springs, Nevada. The 1980s Strategic Defense Initiative, or “Star Wars” program, aimed to intercept incoming missiles while facilitating devastating attacks on supposed enemies. A version of the program is still being developed, with the citizens of the Czech Republic and Poland now under pressure to accept parts of a U.S.-designed “missile defense shield.” This is part of a wider strategy of “Full Spectrum Dominance,” which has for some time been official U.S. Defense Policy.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en82) Using surveillance and military equipment located in outer space is now seen as the prime means of protecting U.S. economic and military assets both on Earth and in outer space.

Link: Economy/Overview Effect (1/2)

The notion that going into space will alleviate inequalities and crises on Earth systemically omits questions of social justice. Without prior rejection of capitalist domination on Earth, there is no reason why things would be any different in space.

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Society is increasingly humanizing the cosmos. Satellites have for some time been central to the flow of information, to surveillance, and to the conduct of warfare. As these examples suggest, however, the humanization of the cosmos is primarily benefiting the powerful. These include major economic and military institutions. Furthermore, the forthcoming commodification and colonization of the cosmos is again likely to enhance the interests of the powerful, the major aerospace companies in particular. The time has come to consider alternative forms of cosmic humanization. These would enhance the prospects of the socially marginalized. They would also allow humanity to develop a better understanding of the cosmos and our relationship to it.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en85) Humanizing Outer Space The 1969 Apollo 11 moon landing is often seen as the high point of society’s relationship with outer space. Nothing quite so dramatic or exotic seems to have happened in outer space since. But nearby, parts of the solar system (including the moon, some asteroids, and Mars) are now being routinely circled and explored and analyzed by robots. Furthermore, President Obama has recently made important announcements regarding a new U.S. space program that involves manned missions to Mars by the mid-2030s. But the NASA-based Constellation program to the moon and Mars has been cancelled. Instead, NASA will undertake a long-term research and development program aimed at supporting future forms of propulsion and exploration programs. Even more significant in the short-term is a proposed $25 billion being allocated to NASA to kick-start commercial manned spaceflight over the next five years. New forms of transport to the International Space Station will be funded, this time using innovative forms of “space taxis” designed by private sector space companies.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en84)These plans entail new relations between the private and public sectors in the United States. Meanwhile, a presence in outer space is being developed by other societies. This is partly because such a presence is seen as an important symbol of modernization, progress, and social unity. The Indian government has announced a manned mission to the moon in 2013, the European Space Agency envisages projects to the moon and beyond, and the Chinese government is planning a similar project for 2020. This last development has caused some consternation over Obama’s plans. One suggestion is that the United States may after all be the next to send manned missions to the moon, because China’s space project is seen by some as a military threat that needs forestalling.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en83) Yet among these plans and proposals, it is easy to forget that outer space is already being increasingly humanized. It has now been made an integral part of the way global capitalist society is organized and extended. Satellites, for example, are extremely important elements of contemporary communications systems. These have enabled an increasing number of people to become part of the labor market. Teleworking is the best known example. Satellite-based communications have also facilitated new forms of consumption such as teleshopping. Without satellite-based communications, the global economy in its present form would grind to a halt. Satellites have also been made central to modern warfare. Combined with pilotless Predator drones, they are now being used to observe and attack Taliban and Al-Qaida operatives in Afghanistan and elsewhere. This action is done by remote control from Creech Air Force Base at Indian Springs, Nevada. The 1980s Strategic Defense Initiative, or “Star Wars” program, aimed to intercept incoming missiles while facilitating devastating attacks on supposed enemies. A version of the program is still being developed, with the citizens of the Czech Republic and Poland now under pressure to accept parts of a U.S.-designed “missile defense shield.” This is part of a wider strategy of “Full Spectrum Dominance,” which has for some time been official U.S. Defense Policy.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en82) Using surveillance and military equipment located in outer space is now seen as the prime means of protecting U.S. economic and military assets both on Earth and in outer space. Less dangerously, but still very expensively, a full-scale space-tourism industry has for some time been under active development. Dennis Tito, a multi-millionaire, made the first tourist trip into outer space in 2001. Richard Branson’s Virgin Galactic has now sold over three hundred seats at $200,000 apiece to its first tourists in outer space. The program is due to start in 2011, with spaceports for this novel form of travel now being built in Alaska, California, Florida, New Mexico, Virginia, Wisconsin, the United Arab Emirates, and Esrange in Sweden. Excursions circling the moon, likely to cost the galactic visitors around $100,000,000, are now under development. Since the Renaissance period of the sixteenth century, the word “humanization” has been used to connote something beneficial, especially to human beings. As we will now see, humanizing the cosmos is regarded in just these terms by some influential proponents of space travel and space colonization. The Space Renaissance Initiative One response to cosmic humanization is to welcome it as an early stage of a wholly beneficial cosmic human society, one eventually encompassing the solar system and beyond. Such is the view of the Space Renaissance Initiative, an international group of over seventy private organizations now promoting the expansion of society into the cosmos. The aims and ideals of the Space Renaissance are made clear by the Initiative’s manifesto published in 2010. It reads: Help the Space Economy Revolution! The global economy is entering a deep crisis, the worst since 1929. This is the second act of the “Crisis of Closed-World Ideologies”, which has been developing throughout the 20thcentury. In 1989 the fall of the Berlin wall was the Crisis of Collectivist Ideology. The recent massive failure of the financial system is the Crisis of Neo-Liberal Ideology. Both these ideologies failed because they are based upon a closed-world, terro-centric philosophy. There are now almost 7 billion humans making massive demands on planet Earth: we urgently need to open the frontier, and move to a wider vision of our world, so as to access geo-lunar system resources and energy. In short we need a new “Open World Philosophy”. The alternative would be the implosion and collapse of our civilization.[5](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en81)

<card continues>

Link: Economy/Overview Effect (2/2)

<card continued>

In short, the Space Renaissance Initiative argues, society is undergoing massive social, environmental, and population crises because it is thinking too small. The energy of the sun can, for example, be made into a source of clean power from outer space, which would solve society’s energy shortages at a stroke. The Initiative argues that opening up the cosmos to humanity—colonizing the solar system, and opening up resources in the moon, Mars, and the asteroids—could be central to social and environmental salvation. The progress made by the private sector in developing technologies and efficiencies for space tourism means that commercial enterprise can now start planning to venture still further afield. The philosophical roots of the Space Initiative are no less than the sixteenth-century Italian Renaissance and the Enlightenment. With the enlightened patronage of such families as the Medicis, an unprecedented new age of development took place: arts knew a wonderful age of innovation, culture took on some essential principles of classical Greek philosophy, and modern science was born, with men like Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, and later Copernicus and Galileo leading the way. This movement led to the Age of Enlightenment and its most famous offspring: the American and French Revolutions. The manifesto also praises the writings of Descartes, Voltaire, and Jefferson. The belief of these philosophers in the enterprising individual, in freedom, in liberty, and in reason all mean that political power should be vested in the common person and not in states, kings, and nobility. The Space Renaissance Initiative believes in these concepts, seeing them as the basis of a new, progressive, liberating, humanization of the cosmos. But there are surely major problems here. For example, any claim that the Medici family (and similar families such as the Borgias) helped overthrow feudalism is far-fetched. The Medicis were bankers and merchants who made their money at the center of an emerging global mercantilist capitalism, one based in Northern Italy. They used this money to enhance their position within their feudal societies. Members of the Medicis even made themselves into popes, thus further enhancing their wealth and that of their many illegitimate offspring. Another of the Medicis was made the Queen of France. The language used by intellectual elites of the day was Latin. This appealed to scholars across Europe but not to the great mass of individuals living in Florence, Milan, or Venice.[6](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en80) The Medicis and individuals such as Leonardo are often celebrated as examples of “The Renaissance Universal Man,” one capable of spanning every kind of human practice such as art, music, and politics. This “Man” is perhaps best symbolized by Leonardo’s famous image of a male human being, stretched over the circle of the cosmos, his head in the heavens and his bowels located in earthly regions. But this Renaissance Man—or Woman—can also be seen as prefiguring the self-centered, narcissistic individualism of our own day, one seeing the whole of the cosmos at his or her command. This kind of modern human identity has since been enhanced by consumer-based capitalism and, given the problems it creates both for ourselves and our environment, there seems rather little reason to celebrate or restore it. The general point is that the vision of the Space Renaissance Initiative, with its prime focus on the power of the supposedly autonomous and inventive individual, systematically omits questions of social, economic, and military power. Similarly, the Initiative’s focus on the apparently universal benefits of space humanization ignores some obvious questions. What will ploughing large amounts of capital into outer space colonization really do for stopping the exploitation of people and resources back here on earth? The “solution” seems to be simultaneously exacerbating social problems while jetting away from them. Consumer-led industrial capitalism necessarily creates huge social divisions and increasing degradation of the environment. Why should a galactic capitalism do otherwise? The Space Renaissance Initiative argues that space-humanization is necessarily a good thing for the environment by introducing new space-based technologies such as massive arrays of solar panels. But such “solutions” are again imaginary. Cheap electricity is most likely to increase levels of production and consumption back on earth. Environmental degradation will be exacerbated rather than diminished by this technological fix. A simplistic and idealistic view of history, technology, and human agency therefore underpins the starting point of the Space Renaissance Initiative. Humanization in this shape—one now finding favor in official government circles—raises all kinds of highly problematic issues for society and the environment. What would an alternative, more critical, perspective on humanizing the cosmos tell us?

Link: Economic Crisis

Capital regards economic growth and downturn as equal opportunities for growth – and the ecological crisis is worsened either way.

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 142-44

There are crises within capitalism, which both generates them and is dependent upon them. Crises are ruptures in the accumulation process, causing the wheel to slow, but also stimulating new turns; they take many shapes and have long or short cycles, and many intricate effects upon ecologies. A recession may reduce demand and so take some of the load off resources; recovery may increase this demand, but also occur with greater efficiency, hence also reduce the load. Thus economic crises con­dition the ecological crisis, but have no necessary effect on it. There is no singular generalization that covers all cases. James O’Connor summarizes the complexity: Capitalist accumulation normally causes ecological crisis of certain types; economic crisis is associated with partly different and partly similar eco­logical problems of different severity; external barriers to capital in the form of scarce resources, urban space, healthy and disciplined wage labour, and other conditions of production may have the effect of raising costs and threatening profits; and finally, environmental and other social movements defending conditions of life, forests, soil quality, amenities, health conditions urban space, and so on, may also raise costs and make capital less flexible.34 But capital gets nature whether on its way up or its way down. In the USA, the boom-boom Clinton years witnessed grotesque increases in matters such as the sowing of the ecosphere with toxic chemicals,35 while the sharp downturn that accompanied the George W Bush presidency was immedi­ately met by rejection of the Kyoto protocols. From the standpoint of ecosystems, the phase of the business cycle is considerably less relevant, then, than the fact of the business cycle, and the wanton economic system it expresses. Economic problems interact with ecological problems, while ecological problems (including the effects of ecological movements) interact with economic problems. This is all at the level of the trees. For the forest, meanwhile, we see the effects on the planetary ecology caused by the growth of the system as a whole. Here the dark angel is the thermodynamic lax where mounting entropy appears as ecosystemic decay. The immediate impacts of this on life are what energize the resistance embodied in the environmental and ecological movements. Meanwhile, the economy goes on along its growth-intoxicated way, immune to the effects of ecosystem breakdown on accumulation, and blindly careening toward the abyss. The conclusion must be that irrespective of the particulars of one eco­nomic interaction or another, the system as a whole is causing irreparable damage to its ecological foundations, and that it does so precisely as it grows. And since the one underlying feature of all aspects of capital is the relentless pressure to grow, we are obliged to bring down the capitalist system as a whole and replace it with an ecologically viable alternative, if we want to save our species along with numberless others.

Link: The State

The state structurally imposes capitalist forms of social relations to ensure the perpetual maintenance of capital’s domination

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 124-25

The state is what steps forward to manage this conflict so that the ruling class gets its way without causing society to fly apart. It is the state’s province to deal with class contradiction as it works itself out in numberless ways to build its armies and use them in conquest (thereby reinforcing patriarchal and violent values), to codify property to set forth laws to punish those who would trangress property relations and to regulate contracts between in­dividuals who play by the rules, to institutionalize police, courts and prisons to back up those laws, or to certify what is proper and right in the education of the young, or the marriage of the sexes, or establish the religions that justify God’s ways to mere man , or to institutionalize science and education — in sum, to regulate and enforce the class structure, and to channel the flux of history in the direction of the elites. The state institutionalizes patriarchy as well as class, and hence maintains the societal ground for the gendered bifurcation of nature. Furthermore, inasmuch as the modern state is also a nation-state, it employs the attachment of a people to its land as a source of legitimation, and thus incorporates the history of nature into myths of wholeness and integrity. All aspects of the domination of nature are in fact woven into the fabric by means of which the state holds society together, from which it follows that to give coherence to this narrative and make a difference in it, we have to attend to the state and its ultimate dependance upon maintaining the class structure. All of this is to play a basic role in the unfolding of contemporary ecological struggles, as we discuss in the next section.

Link: K Affs

Your leftist stance invokes a bunch of buzzwards that obscure complicity with capitalist politics – only resistance in line with an ethic of revolution solves.

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg.189-190.

With such contradictions, Dirlik’s concluding affirmation of a politics of dialogue, coalition building and Henry Giroux’s “border pedagogy” are, ultimately, evasions of the question of how to theorize resistance to globalization without an affirmation of the local and cultural. Now, at this point, perhaps some readers will ask whether all resistance is not, on some level, local. Doesn’t one resist a specific assault on someone’s rights or some collective set of living conditions or some crucial condition of democracy? Doesn’t a revolution always overthrow a single state? Leaving aside for now the way in which postmodern articulations of the global and local serve to avoid questions of the state and sovereignty, I would concede this point in its obvious, banal sense. The question is whether the logic of resistance, the materials of resistance, and the legitimacy of resistant practices can be found in the local, cultural site. This is what postmodern cultural studies, even more forcefully in its international phase, insists upon, and this is what I do deny. Resistance, in global capi­talism, is, in the first instance, only resistance in any meaningful sense in­sofar as it theorizes (and provides occasions for other theorizations of) the articulation of the interlocking economic, political, and ideological forms constitutive of the globe. The most productive way of theorizing the local in these terms is by pri­oritizing politics, as I suggested in the introduction and first chapter in particular, as a space of accountability to the conditions of openness that make politics possible in the first place; such an accountability situates any political action and space in relation to an outside—i.e., the theoreti­cal struggles that are implicated in politics, before which politics “ap­pears,” and that come to meet or address political actions. Such a politics must secure its conditions of possibility in the name of the level and modes of world-responsibility that contemporary social conditions re­quire. These conditions of possibility point in several directions: toward the economic, in the first case interference with and ultimately suppres­sion of the logic of capital and private property; toward the reciprocally constitutive political and theoretical principles themselves, engaging polit­ical action as instances of theory and practicing theory as clarification of the articulation of the political and the economic; and toward the outside, seeking not a neutral judge but a surfaced polemic aimed at making visi­ble the relevant economic/political/ideological articulation. So, there is, of course, a “direct” antagonist, but it exists as this articulation, in oppo­sition to which political action pursues a different articulation via ideol­ogy critique. In other words, an antilocalist politics starts with the recipro­cal clarification of principles, concepts, and globally situated antipolitical violence (manifested always ideologically) —not in some remainder where traditional, modern and postmodern, and local and global collide and de­construct each other.

Link: Biopower

Their focus on power mis-theorizes how power operates and trades off with a Marxist approach to politics.

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg. 105.

Postmodern cultural studies also rewrites the category of materiality to refer to local practices and, ultimately, the body. For example, postmodern cultural studies theorist John Fiske, while defining the material in terms of economic constraints, at the same time argues for an understanding of materiality as the absence of any possibility for abstraction, of any dis­tancing from the products of culture. “Culture,” he says, “is inescapably material: distantiation is an unattainable luxury. The culture of everyday life is concrete, contextualized, and lived, just as deprivation is concrete, contextualized and lived” (1992, 155). Since he identifies the material with the lived experience of everyday life in the face of oppression and with the construction of an individualized environment that makes sur­vival and resistance possible, he goes on to locate materiality in the body: “The body and its specific behavior is where the power system stops be­ing abstract and becomes material” (162). For this reason, he considers it important to develop a “bottom-up” (165) notion of subjectivity, as op­posed to those theories in which contradictions in subjectivity “are traced back to the complex elaborations of late capitalist societies” (161). This, I argue, excludes the possibility of understanding materiality in terms of the systemic connections between specific practices. It reduces subjectivity to the local contexts in which individualized modes of life are constructed, and it refuses any theory that does not involve “the development of the ability to experience as far as possible from the inside other people’s ways of living” (159). In this case, of course, it becomes impossible to theorize the world market or capitalist class domination, since these would be con­sidered abstract categories that cannot be inside anyone’s way of living.

Link: Localism

Local changes are doomed for achieving global change, this prevents anti-capitalist action.

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg. 146-147.

Habermas’s understanding of undistorted communication is situated within the same problematic as the postmodernism of Lyotard in a much more fundamental sense than would be indicated by the apparent opposi­tion between them. Both locate emancipatory knowledges and politics in the liberation of language from technocratic imperatives. And the political consequences are the same as well. In both cases, local transformations (the deconstruction and reconstruction of distorted modes of communica­tion) that create more democratic or rational sites of intersubjectivity are all that is seen as possible, “with the goal,” as Brantlinger says, “of at least local emancipations from the structure of economic, political and cultural domination” (1990, 191—192, emphasis added). The addition of “at least” to the kinds of changes sought suggests a broader, potentially global role for critique, such as showing “how lines of force in society can be transformed into authentic modes of participatory decision making” (19711. However, the transition from one mode of transformation to an­other—what should be the fundamental task of cultural studies—is left unconceptualized and is implicitly understood as a kind of additive or cu­mulative spread of local democratic sites until society as a whole is trans­formed. What this overlooks, of course, is the way in which, as long as global economic and political structures remain unchanged and unchal­lenged, local emancipations can only be redistributions—redistributions that actually support existing social relations by merely shifting the greater burdens onto others who are less capable of achieving their own local emancipation. This implicit alliance between the defenders of modernity and their postmodern critics (at least on the fundamental ques­tion) also suggests that we need to look for the roots and consequences of this alliance in the contradictions of the formation of the cultural studies public intellectual.

Impact: General

Capitalism renders whole populations standing reserves, making widespread extermination inevitable, culminating in the destruction of the planet

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, “Capitalism and Genocide”, #36, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html

Mass death, and genocide, the deliberate and systematic extermination of whole groups of human beings, have become an integral part of the social landscape of capitalism in its phase of decadence. Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not merely the names of discrete sites where human beings have been subjected to forms of industrialized mass death, but synecdoches for the death-world that is a component of the capitalist mode of production in this epoch. In that sense, I want to argue that the Holocaust, for example, was not a Jewish catastrophe, nor an atavistic reversion to the barbarism of a past epoch, but rather an event produced by the unfolding of the logic of capitalism itself. Moreover, Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not "past", but rather futural events, objective-real possibilities on the Front of history, to use concepts first articulated by the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch. The ethnic cleansing which has been unleashed in Bosnia and Kosovo, the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda, the mass death to which Chechnya has been subjected, the prospect for a nuclear war on the Indian sub-continent, are so many examples of the future which awaits the human species as the capitalist mode of production enters a new millenium. Indeed, it is just such a death-world that constitutes the meaning of one pole of the historic alternative which Rosa Luxemburg first posed in the midst of the slaughter inflicted on masses of conscripts during World War I: socialism or barbarism! \*\*\*Continues\*\*\* The real domination of capital is characterized by the penetration of the law of value into every segment of social existence. As Georg Lukács put it in his History and Class Consciousness, this means that the commodity ceases to be "one form among many regulating the metabolism of human society," to become its "universal structuring principle." From its original locus at the point of production, in the capitalist factory, which is the hallmark of the formal domination of capital, the law of value has systematically spread its tentacles to incorporate not just the production of commodities, but their circulation and consumption. Moreover, the law of value also penetrates and then comes to preside over the spheres of the political and ideological, including science and technology themselves. This latter occurs not just through the transformation of the fruits of technology and science into commodities, not just through the transformation of technological and scientific research itself (and the institutions in which it takes place) into commodities, but also, and especially, through what Lukács designates as the infiltration of thought itself by the purely technical, the very quantification of rationality, the instrumentalization of reason; and, I would argue, the reduction of all beings (including human beings) to mere objects of manipulation and control. As Lukács could clearly see even in the age of Taylorism, "this rational mechanisation extends right into the worker's `soul'." In short, it affects not only his outward behavior, but her very internal, psychological, makeup. The phenomenon of reification, inherent in the commodity-form, and its tendential penetration into the whole of social existence, which Lukács was one of the first to analyze, is a hallmark of the real domination of capital: "Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a `phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people." Reification, the seeming transformation of social relations into relations between things, has as one of its outcomes what the German-Jewish thinker H.G.Adler designated as "the administered man" [Der verwaltete Mensch]. For Adler, when human beings are administered, they are treated as things, thereby clearing the way for their removal or elimination by genocide. The outcome of such a process can be seen in the bureaucractic administration of the Final Solution, in which the organization of genocide was the responsibility of desk killers like Adolf Eichmann who could zealously administer a system of mass murder while displaying no particular hatred for his victims, no great ideological passion for his project, and no sense that those who went to the gas chambers were human beings and not things. The features of the desk killer, in the person of Eichmann, have been clearly delineated by Hannah Arendt. He is the high-level functionary in a vast bureaucratic organization who does his killing from behind a desk, from which he rationally plans and organizes mass murder; treating it as simply a technical task, no different than the problem of transporting scrap metal. The desk killer is the quintessential bureaucrat functioning according to the imperatives of the death-world. As a human type, the desk killer, that embodiment of the triumph of instrumental reason, has become a vital part of the state apparatus of late capitalism. Here, the Lukácsian concept of reification, the Adlerian concept of the administered man, and the Arendtian portrait of the desk killer, can be joined to Martin Heidegger's concept of das Gestell, enframing, in which everything real, all beings, including humans, are treated as so much Bestand, standing-reserve or raw material, to be manipulated at will. This reduction of humans to a raw material is the antechamber to a world in which they can become so many waste products to be discarded or turned into ashes in the gas chambers of Auschwitz or at ground zero at Hiroshima. \*\*\*Continues\*\*\* The immanent tendencies of the capitalist mode of production which propel it towards a catastrophic economic crisis, also drive it towards mass murder and genocide. In that sense, the death-world, and the prospect of an Endzeit cannot be separated from the continued existence of humanity's subordination to the law of value. Reification, the overmanned world, bio-politics, state racism, the constitution of a pure community directed against alterity, each of them features of the economic and ideological topography of the real domination of capital, create the possibility and the need for genocide. We should have no doubt that the survival of capitalism into this new millenium will entail more and more frequent recourse to mass murder.

Impact: Ethics

Our obligation to reject capital is greater than any notions of calculation could conclude – only the alt acknowledges hope to stop mass suffering

Glyn Daly, senior lecturer in politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College Northampton, Conversations With Zizek, 2004, pp. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

Impact: Dehumanization (1/2)

Capitalism is de-humanizing—alienation is uniquely atomizing, erasing value to life and rendering populations calculable and exterminable

Morgareidge, 1998 (Clayton, associate professor of philosophy at Lewis and Clark, published in teaching philosophy, June 2000, Volume II, Number 3, “Why Capitalism is Evil,” June 21st, 2011, <http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html>)

In recent commentaries for the Old Mole I have been trying to make capitalism look bad -- as bad as it really is.  I have argued that capitalism is war, and that those of us who do not own capital suffer from it just as do civilian populations caught between opposing armies, or as foot soldiers conscripted into armies fighting for interests that are not our own.  I've tried to show that capitalism is the violent negation of democracy, for it is the interests of those who own capital that determine how we live: their jobs, products, services, manufactured culture, and propaganda shape our lives and our minds.   Today I'd like to point to the ways in which capital undermines the foundation of moral life. Well, what is the foundation of moral life?  What makes it possible for human beings to recognize that they have responsibilities to each other and to their communities?  For example: What could possibly make anyone willing to pay living wages to workers in Indonesia or Haiti if you can get them to work for less?  The 18th Century philosopher David Hume asks, What reason can anyone give me to not to prefer the annihilation of all mankind to a scratch on my finger?  Hume is one of many philosophers who argue that no such reason can be given.  This means that the foundation of ethics lies not in reason, but rather in our passions or our hearts.  For Hume it is part of our nature that we feel sympathy for each other, and this sympathy counters our narrow self-interest.   Other philosophers have taken similar positions.  Josiah Royce an American philosopher of the last century argued that you do not really understand another person if you do not understand her aspirations, fears, and needs.  But to understand someone's feelings is, in part, to share them.  And you cannot share an aspiration or a need without wanting to see it fulfilled, nor can you share a fear without hoping that it will not come to pass.  So the mere recognition of what other human beings are involves us in wanting to see them live and prosper.  The French-Jewish philosopher Emmanual Levinás whose major work appeared in 1961 claims that ethics arises in the experience of the face of the other.  The human face reveals its capacity for suffering, a suffering we are capable of either inflicting or opposing.  So to look into the face of another human being is to see the commandment, Thou shalt not kill.  Another American philosopher, Nel Noddings, in her 1984 book Caring, argues that the ethical commitment arises out of the caring response that most of us feel towards those who, like children, are in need.   Most parents encourage this caring response in their children, with the result that we grow up with an interest in cultivating our own capacity to care for others.  Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior.  The 20th century proves otherwise.  What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other.   So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response?   This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism.  But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care.  Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism.  Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than any thing else.  To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx.    Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money.  For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own.   Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.

<card continues>

Impact: Dehumanization (2/2)

  If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products.  If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced.Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on.  Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life.  The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth.  If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life.  But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry.  In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people.  As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth.  Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do.  Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable.  People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress.  They still think they can't stop it.  And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership.  Only a minority ("idealists")  can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making.   Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

Impact: Imperialism

**Capitalism is reliant on inevitable imperialist tendancies to sustain growth. This also leads to monopolies which straight turns the supposed ‘free market’ and collapses into corporate totalitarianism.**

Vladimir Ilyich **Lenin** January-June, 1916 (Imperialism, The Highest Stage Of Capitalism, A Popular Outline), {Ix. Critique Of Imperialism} Tim Delaney & Kevin Goins (2008) Lenin Internet Archive 2005. Lenin’s Selected Works, Progress Publishers, 1963, Moscow, Volume 1, Pp. 667–766. First Published In Mid-1917 In Pamphlet Form, Petrograd. Published According To The Manuscript And Verified With The Text Of The Pamphlet.

By the critique of imperialism, in the broad sense of the term, we mean the attitude of the different classes of society towards imperialist policy in connection with their general ideology.

The enormous dimensions of finance capital concentrated in a few hands and creating an extraordinarily dense and widespread network of relationships and connections which subordinates not only the small and medium, but also the very small capitalists and small masters, on the one hand, and the increasingly intense struggle waged against other national state groups of financiers for the division of the world and domination over other countries, on the other hand, cause the propertied classes to go over entirely to the side of imperialism. “General” enthusiasm over the prospects of imperialism, furious defence of it and painting it in the brightest colours—such are the signs of the times. Imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. No Chinese Wall separates it from the other classes. The leaders of the present-day, so-called, “Social-Democratic” Party of Germany are justly called “social-imperialists”, that is, socialists in words and imperialists in deeds; but as early as 1902, Hobson noted the existence in Britain of “Fabian imperialists” who belonged to the opportunist Fabian Society.

Bourgeois scholars and publicists usually come out in defence of imperialism in a somewhat veiled form; they obscure its complete, domination and its deep-going roots, strive to push specific and secondary details into the forefront and do their very best to distract attention from essentials by means of absolutely ridiculous schemes for “reform”, such as police supervision of the trusts or banks, etc. Cynical and frank imperialists who are bold enough to admit the absurdity of the idea of reforming the fundamental characteristics of imperialism are a rarer phenomenon.

The questions as to whether it is possible to reform the basis of imperialism, whether to go forward to the further intensification and deepening of the antagonisms which it engenders. or backward, towards allaying these antagonisms, are fundamental questions in the critique of imperialism. Since the specific political features of imperialism are reaction everywhere and increased national oppression due to the oppression of the financial oligarchy and the elimination of free competition, a petty-bourgeois-democratic opposition to imperialism arose at the beginning of the twentieth century in nearly all imperialist countries. Kautsky not only did not trouble to oppose, was not only unable to oppose this petty-bourgeois reformist opposition, which is really reactionary in its economic basis, but became merged with it in practice, and this is precisely where Kautsky and the broad international Kautskian trend deserted Marxism.

In the United States, the imperialist war waged against Spain in 1898 stirred up the opposition of the “anti-imperialists”, the last of the Mohicans of bourgeois democracy who declared this war to be “criminal”, regarded the annexation of foreign territories as a violation of the Constitution, declared that the treatment of Aguinaldo, leader of the Filipinos (the Americans promised him the independence of his country, but later landed troops and annexed it), was “jingo treachery”, and quoted the words of Lincoln: “When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs others, it is no longer self-government; it is despotism.” [2] But as long, as all this criticism shrank from recognising the inseverable bond between imperialism and the trusts, and, therefore, between imperialism and the foundations of capitalism, while it shrank from joining the forces engendered by large-scale capitalism and its development-it remained a “pious wish”.

The simple-mindedness on the part of the bourgeois economists is not surprising; moreover, it is in their interest to pretend to be so naive and to talk “seriously” about peace under imperialism. But what remains of Kautsky’s Marxism, when, in 1914, 1915 and 1916, he takes up the same bourgeois-reformist point of view and affirms that “everybody is agreed” (imperialists, pseudo- socialists and social-pacifists) on the matter of peace? Instead of an analysis of imperialism and an exposure of the depths of its contradictions, we have nothing but a reformist “pious wish” to wave them aside, to evade them.

Kautsky’s theoretical critique of imperialism has nothing in common with Marxism and serves only as a preamble to propaganda for peace and unity with the opportunists and the social-chauvinists, precisely for the reason that it evades and obscures the very profound and fundamental contradictions of imperialism: the contradictions between monopoly and free competition which exists side by side with it, between the gigantic “operations” (and gigantic profits) of finance capital and “honest” trade in the free market, the contradiction between cartels and trusts, on the one hand, and non-cartelised industry, on the other, etc.

The notorious theory of “ultra-imperialism”, invented by Kautsky, is just as reactionary. Compare his arguments on this subject in 1915, with Hobson’s arguments in 1902.

Impact: Environment (1/2)

Capitalism destroys the environment—causes multiple species extinctions and eradicates healthy biospheres

Magdoff and Foster ‘10(Fred,is professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont and adjunct professor of crop and soil science at Cornell University; John Bellamy, is editor of *Monthly Review* and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism,” 03/10, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism>) DOA: 7/22/11

No-growth capitalism is an oxymoron: when growth ceases, the system is in a state of crisis with considerable suffering among the unemployed. Capitalism’s basic driving force and its whole reason for existence is the amassing of profits and wealth through the accumulation (savings and investment) process. It recognizes no limits to its own self-expansion—not in the economy as a whole; not in the profits desired by the wealthy; and not in the increasing consumption that people are cajoled into desiring in order to generate greater profits for corporations. The environment exists, not as a place with inherent boundaries within which human beings must live together with earth’s other species, but as a realm to be exploited in a process of growing economic expansion. It is true that the system can continue to move forward, to some extent, as a result of financial speculation leveraged by growing debt, even in the face of a tendency to slow growth in the underlying economy. But this means, as we have seen again and again, the growth of financial bubbles that inevitably burst.24 There is no alternative under capitalism to the endless expansion of the “real economy” (i.e., production), irrespective of actual human needs, consumption, or the environment. As companies expand, they saturate, or come close to saturating, the “home” market and look for new markets abroad to sell their goods. In addition, they and their governments (working on behalf of corporate interests) help to secure entry and control over key natural resources such as oil and a variety of minerals. We are in the midst of a “land-grab,” as private capital and government sovereign wealth funds strive to gain control of vast acreage throughout the world to produce food and biofuel feedstock crops for their “home” markets. It is estimated that some thirty million hectares of land (roughly equal to two-thirds of the arable land in Europe), much of them in Africa, have been recently acquired or are in the process of being acquired by rich countries and international corporations.25 This global land seizure (even if by “legal” means) can be regarded as part of the larger history of imperialism. The story of centuries of European plunder and expansion is well documented. The current U.S.-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan follow the same general historical pattern, and are clearly related to U.S. attempts to control the main world sources of oil and gas.26 Today multinational (or transnational) corporations scour the world for resources and opportunities wherever they can find them, exploiting cheap labor in poor countries and reinforcing, rather than reducing, imperialist divisions. The result is a more rapacious global exploitation of nature and increased differentials of wealth and power. Such corporations have no loyalty to anything but their own bottom lines. The irreversible exhaustion of finite natural resources will leave future generations without the possibility of having use of these resources. Natural resources are used in the process of production—oil, gas, and coal (fuel), water (in industry and agriculture), trees (for lumber and paper), a variety of mineral deposits (such as iron ore, copper, and bauxite), and so on. Some resources, such as forests and fisheries, are of a finite size, but can be renewed by natural processes if used in a planned system that is flexible enough to change as conditions warrant. Future use of other resources—oil and gas, minerals, aquifers in some desert or dryland areas (prehistorically deposited water)—are limited forever to the supply that currently exists. The water, air, and soil of the biosphere can continue to function well for the living creatures on the planet only if pollution doesn’t exceed their limited capacity to assimilate and render the pollutants harmless. Business owners and managers generally consider the short term in their operations—most take into account the coming three to five years, or, in some rare instances, up to ten years. This is the way they must function because of unpredictable business conditions (phases of the business cycle, competition from other corporations, prices of needed inputs, etc.) and demands from speculators looking for short-term returns. They therefore act in ways that are largely oblivious of the natural limits to their activities—as if there is an unlimited supply of natural resources for exploitation. Even if the reality of limitation enters their consciousness, it merely speeds up the exploitation of a given resource, which is extracted as rapidly as possible, with capital then moving on to new areas of resource exploitation. When each individual capitalist pursues the goal of making a profit and accumulating capital, decisions are made that collectively harm society as a whole. The length of time before nonrenewable deposits are exhausted depends on the size of the deposit and the rate of extraction of the resource. While depletion of some resources may be hundreds of years away (assuming that the rate of growth of extraction remains the same), limits for some important ones—oil and some minerals—are not that far off. For example, while predictions regarding peak oil vary among energy analysts—going by the conservative estimates of oil companies themselves, at the rate at which oil is currently being used, known reserves will be exhausted within the next fifty years. The prospect of peak oil is projected in numerous corporate, government, and scientific reports. The question today is not whether peak oil is likely to arrive soon, but simply how soon.27 Even if usage doesn’t grow, the known deposits of the critical fertilizer ingredient phosphorus that can be exploited on the basis of current technology will be exhausted in this century.28 Faced with limited natural resources, there is no rational way to prioritize under a modern capitalist system, in which the well-to-do with their economic leverage decide via the market how commodities are allocated. When extraction begins to decline, as is projected for oil within the near future, price increases will put even more pressure on what had been, until recently, the boast of world capitalism: the supposedly prosperous “middle-class” workers of the countries of the center. The well-documented decline of many ocean fish species, almost to the point of extinction, is an example of how renewable resources can be exhausted. It is in the short-term individual interests of the owners of fishing boats—some of which operate at factory scale, catching, processing, and freezing fish—to maximize the take. Hence, the fish are depleted. No one protects the common interest. In a system run generally on private self-interest and accumulation, the state is normally incapable of doing so. This is sometimes called the tragedy of the commons. But it should be called the tragedy of the private exploitation of the commons.

<card continues>

Impact: Environment (2/2)

<card continued>

The situation would be very different if communities that have a stake in the continued availability of a resource managed the resource in place of the large-scale corporation. Corporations are subject to the single-minded goal of maximizing short-term profits—after which they move on, leaving devastation behind, in effect mining the earth. Although there is no natural limit to human greed, there are limits, as we are daily learning, to many resources, including “renewable” ones, such as the productivity of the seas. (The depletion of fish off the coast of Somalia because of overfishing by factory-scale fishing fleets is believed to be one of the causes for the rise of piracy that now plagues international shipping in the area. Interestingly, the neighboring Kenyan fishing industry is currently rebounding because the pirates also serve to keep large fishing fleets out of the area.) The exploitation of renewable resources before they can be renewed is referred to as “overshooting” the resource. This is occurring not only with the major fisheries, but also with groundwater (for example, the Oglala aquifer in the United States, large areas of northwestern India, Northern China, and a number of locations in North Africa and the Middle East), with tropical forests, and even with soils. The earth system can be seen as consisting of a number of critical biogeochemical processes that, for hundreds of millions of years, have served to reproduce life. In the last 12 thousand or so years the world climate has taken the relatively benign form associated with the geological epoch known as the Holocene, during which civilization arose. Now, however, the socioeconomic system of capitalism has grown to such a scale that it overshoots fundamental planetary boundaries—the carbon cycle, the nitrogen cycle, the soil, the forests, the oceans. More and more of the terrestrial (land-based) photosynthetic product, upwards of 40 percent, is now directly accounted for by human production. All ecosystems on earth are in visible decline. With the increasing scale of the world economy, the human-generated rifts in the earth’s metabolism inevitably become more severe and more multifarious. Yet, the demand for more and greater economic growth and accumulation, even in the wealthier countries, is built into the capitalist system. As a result, the world economy is one massive bubble.

Impact: Environment

Capitalism causes inability to conserve energy and resources—need to make a sustainable world

Foster, Clark, and York ’10 (john B., editor of *Monthly Review* and professor of sociology, University of Oregon; Brett, assistant professor of sociology, North Carolina State University; Richard, co-editor of *Organization & Environment* and associate professor of sociology, University of Oregon “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency” 11/10, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency#top>)

The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating what Alfred Lotka called the “maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The deemphasis on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35 Seen in the context of a capitalist society,environmental problems facing society can’t be solved by purely technological means. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39 The result is the production of mountains upon mountains of commodities, cheapening unit costs and leading to greater squandering of material resources. Under monopoly capitalism, moreover, such commodities increasingly take the form of artificial use values, promoted by a vast marketing system and designed to instill ever more demand for commodities and the exchange values they represent—as a substitute for the fulfillment of genuine human needs. Unnecessary, wasteful goods are produced by useless toil to enhance purely economic values at the expense of the environment. Any slowdown in this process of ecological destruction, under the present system, spells economic disaster. In Jevons’s eyes, the “momentous choice” raised by a continuation of business as usual was simply “between brief but true [national] greatness and longer continued mediocrity.” He opted for the former—the maximum energy flux. A century and a half later, in our much bigger, more global—but no less expansive—economy, it is no longer simply national supremacy that is at stake, but the fate of the planet itself. To be sure, there are those who maintain that we should “live high now and let the future take care of itself.” To choose this course, though, is to court planetary disaster. The only real answer for humanity (including future generations) and the earth as a whole is to alter the social relations of production, to create a system in which efficiency is no longer a curse—a higher system in which equality, human development, community, and sustainability are the explicit goals.

AT: Capitalism Good

We control uniqueness - capitalism generates internal contradictions that make social upheaval inevitable - there's only a question of whether socialism or barbarism emerge victorious

Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, "What is Orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever," Red Critique, Spring 2001, accessed 1/3/10 http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

It is only Orthodox Marxism that explains socialism as an historical inevitability that is tied to the development of social production itself and its requirements. Orthodox Marxism makes socialism scientific because it explains how in the capitalist system, based on the private consumption of labor-power (competition), the objective tendency is to reduce the amount of time labor spends in reproducing itself (necessary labor) while expanding the amount of time labor is engaged in producing surplus-value (surplus-labor) for the capitalist through the introduction of machinery into the production process by the capitalists themselves to lower their own labor costs. Because of the competitive drive for profits under capitalism it is historically inevitable that a point is reached when the technical mastery—the amount of time socially necessary on average to meet the needs of society through the processing of natural resources—is such that the conditions of the workers worsen relative to the owners and becomes an unbearable global social contradiction in the midst of the ever greater mass of wealth produced. It is therefore just as inevitable that at such a moment it obviously makes more sense to socialize production and meet the needs of all to avoid the explosive social conflicts perpetually generated by private property than to maintain the system at the risk of total social collapse on a world scale. "Socialism or barbarism" (Luxemburg) is the inevitable choice faced by humanity because of capitalism. Either maintain private property and the exploitation of labor in production, in which case more and more social resources will go into policing the growingly desperate surplus-population generated by the technical efficiency of social production, or socialize production and inaugurate a society whose founding principle is "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, Selected Works, 325) and "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works, 53).

AT: Capitalism Good

Only a risk the impacts outweigh the turns—cap is not sustainable.

John Ikerd 06 (Sustaining People through Agriculture series,” Small Farm Today Magazine, Missouri Farm Publications, Clark, MO. November-December 2006. http://web.missouri.edu/~ikerdj/papers/SFT-Sustainable%20Captialism.htm)

A sustainable economy must be based on a fundamentally different paradigm, specifically, on the paradigm of living systems. Living things by nature are self-making, self-renewing, reproductive, and regenerative. Living plants have the natural capacity to capture, organize, and store solar energy, both to support other living organisms and to offset the energy that is inevitably lost to entropy. Living things also have a natural propensity to reproduce their species. Humans, for example, devote large amounts of time and energy to raising families, with very little economic incentive to do so. Obviously, an individual life is not sustainable because every living thing eventually dies. But, communities and societies of living individuals clearly have the capacity and natural propensity to be productive, while devoting a significant part of their life’s energy to conceiving and nurturing the next generation. Relationships within healthy living systems must be mutually beneficial, and thus must be *selective* in nature. All living organisms are made up of cells and each living cell is surrounded by a selective or semi-permeable membrane. These semi-permeable boundaries keep some things in but let other things out and keep some things out but let other things in. Living organisms likewise are defined by boundaries – skin, bark, scales, – that selectively allow different elements – air, water, food, waste, – to enter and to leave the body of the organism. If these boundaries were either completely permeable or impermeable, the organism would be incapable of life, and thus incapable of producing or reproducing. The same principle holds for all living systems: ecosystems, families, communities, economies, cultures. The relationships among elements of healthy natural ecosystems are by nature mutually beneficial. However, relationships among humans and between humans and nature are matters of choice, and thus must be consciously and purposefully selective. People must be willing and able to choose to maintain positive relationships with other people and to choose to take care of the earth, not only to benefit themselves, but also to benefit those of future generations. Capitalism provides no economic incentives to sustain life on earth, but humans have the innate capacity and natural tendency to do so. Throughout human history, people have chosen families, communities, and societies over isolation, even when it was not in their short run, individual self-interests to do so. Throughout human history, people have shown a sense of respect and reverence toward the earth, and have attempted to care for the earth, even when here was no incentive to do so. It’s only within the past few decades that humans in large numbers have abandoned their basic nature as living, caring beings in pursuit of their narrow, individual self-interests. Not until the last few decades, were the social and ethical constraints removed, turning capitalism into an unsustainable system of extraction and exploitation.

AT: Capitalism Good—Space

**Capitalism not only option for space exploration**

Mike Palecek 09 ([Capitalism Versus Science](http://www.marxist.com/capitalism-versus-science.htm), <http://www.marxist.com/capitalism-versus-science.htm>)

The ultimate proof of capitalism’s hindrance of science and technology comes not from capitalism, but from the alternative. While the Soviet Union under Stalin was far from the ideal socialist society (something which we have explained extensively elsewhere), its history gives us valuable insight into the potential of a nationalized planned economy. In 1917 the Bolsheviks took control of a backwards, semi-feudal, third world country that had been ruined by the First World War. In a matter of decades, it was transformed into a leading super-power. The USSR would go on to be the first to put a satellite into orbit, the first to put a man in space, and the first to build a permanently manned outpost in space. Soviet scientists pushed the frontiers of knowledge, particularly in the areas of Mathematics, Astronomy, Nuclear Physics, Space Exploration and Chemistry. Many Soviet era scientists have been awarded Nobel prizes in various fields. These successes are particularly stunning, when one considers the state the country was in when capitalism was overthrown. How were such advancements possible? How did the Soviet Union go from having a population that was 90% illiterate, to having more scientists, doctors and engineers per capita than any other country on Earth in just a few decades? The superiority of the nationalized planned economy and the break from the madness of capitalism is the only explanation. The first step in this process was simply the recognition that science was a priority. Under capitalism, the ability of private companies to develop science and technology is limited by a narrow view of what is profitable. Companies do not plan to advance technology, they plan to build a marketable product and will only do what is necessary to bring that product to market. The Soviets immediately recognized the importance of the overall development of science and technology and linked it to the development of the country as a whole. This broad view allowed them to put substantial resources into all areas of study. Another vital component of their success was the massive expansion of education. By abolishing private schools and providing free education at all levels, individuals in the population were able to meet their potential. A citizen could continue their studies as long as they were capable. By contrast, even many advanced capitalist countries have been unable to eliminate illiteracy today, let alone open up university education to all who are able. Under capitalism, massive financial barriers are placed in front of students, which prevent large portions of the population from reaching their potential. When half of the world’s population is forced to live on less than two dollars a day, we can only conclude that massive reserves of human talent are being wasted. The soviet government immediately tore down all the barriers on science that strangle innovation within the capitalist system. Patents, trade secrets, and private industry were eliminated. This allowed for more collaborative research across fields and a free flow of information between institutions. Religious prejudices that had long held back rational study were pushed aside. One only has to look at the ban on stem-cell research under the Bush regime to see the negative effects religious bigotry can have on science. But it wasn’t all good news under Stalinism. Just as the bureaucracy hindered the development of the economy, it also hindered certain areas of study. While the many barriers of capitalism were broken down, in some cases new ones were erected as the direction of scientific study was subjugated to the needs and desires of the bureaucracy. In the most extreme cases, certain fields of study were outlawed entirely and leading scientists were arrested and sent to labour camps in Siberia. One of the most outrageous cases was Stalin’s contempt for chromosomal genetics. The study of genetics was banned and several prominent geneticists, including Agol, Levit and Nadson were executed. Nikolai Vavilov, one of the Soviet Union’s great geneticists was sent to a labour camp, where he died in 1943. This ban wasn’t overturned until the mid 1960s. These crimes were not crimes of socialism, but of Stalinism. Under a democratically planned economy, there would be no reason for such atrocities. Today, it is the task of those interested in science and socialism to learn the lessons of history. Science is being held back by private interests and industry. A lack of resources for education and research keep doors closed to young aspiring minds. Religious interference locks science in a cage and declares important fields of study off-limits. The chains of the free-market prevent meaningful research from being done. Private companies refuse to let new technologies out of their back rooms. Private collectors hold unique and important specimens for their own personal amusement. Potential cures for deadly diseases are tossed aside to clear the way for research into the latest drug to cure erectile dysfunction. This is madness. Capitalism does not drive innovation, but hinders it at every step. Humanity today is being held back by an economic system designed to enslave the majority for the benefit of a minority. Every aspect of human development is hindered by the erroneously-named free-market. With the development of computers, the internet and new technologies, humanity stands at the doorstep of a bright future of scientific advancement and prosperity. We are learning more and more about every aspect of our existence. What was once impossible, is now tangible. What was once a mystery, is now understood. What was once veiled, is now in plain sight. The advancement of scientific knowledge will one day put even the farthest reaches of the universe at our fingertips. The only thing that stands in our way is capitalism

AT: Capitalism Good—Peace

Capitalist states inevitably vie for the same spheres of influence, recourses, and colonies, as well as for hegemony. At best, their claims of ‘capitalist peace’ are merely short pauses between ultraviolent wars of imperialism.

Vladimir Ilyich **Lenin** January-June, 1916 (Imperialism, The Highest Stage Of Capitalism, A Popular Outline), {Ix. Critique Of Imperialism} Tim Delaney & Kevin Goins (2008) Lenin Internet Archive 2005. Lenin’s Selected Works, Progress Publishers, 1963, Moscow, Volume 1, Pp. 667–766. First Published In Mid-1917 In Pamphlet Form, Petrograd. Published According To The Manuscript And Verified With The Text Of The Pamphlet.

By the critique of imperialism, in the broad sense of the term, we mean the attitude of the different classes of society towards imperialist policy in connection with their general ideology.

Indeed, it is enough to compare well-known and indisputable facts to become convinced of the utter falsity of the prospects which Kautsky tries to conjure up before the German workers (and the workers of all lands). Let us consider India, Indo-China and China. It is known that these three colonial and semi-colonial countries, with a population of six to seven hundred million, are subjected to the exploitation of the finance capital of several imperialist powers: Great Britain, France, Japan, the U.S.A., etc. Let us assume that these imperialist countries form alliances against one another in order to protect or enlarge their possessions, their interests and their spheres of influence in these Asiatic states; these alliances will be “inter-imperialist”, or “ultra-imperialist” alliances. Let us assume that all the imperialist countries conclude an alliance for the “peaceful” division of these parts of Asia; this alliance would be an alliance of “internationally united finance capital”. There are actual examples of alliances of this kind in the history of the twentieth century—the attitude of the powers to China, for instance. We ask, is it “conceivable”, assuming that the capitalist system remains intact—and this is precisely the assumption that Kautsky does make—that such alliances would be more than temporary, that they would eliminate friction, conflicts and struggle in every possible form?

The question has only to be presented clearly for any other than a negative answer to be impossible. This is because the only conceivable basis under capitalism for the division of spheres of influence, interests, colonies, etc., is a calculation of the strength of those participating, their general economic, financial, military xstrength, etc. And the strength of these participants in the division does not change to an equal degree, for the even development of different undertakings, trusts, branches of industry, or countries is impossible under capitalism. Half a century ago Germany was a miserable, insignificant country, if her capitalist strength is compared with that of the Britain of that time; Japan compared with Russia in the same way. Is it “conceivable” that in ten or twenty years’ time the relative strength of the imperialist powers will have remained unchanged? It is out of the question.

Therefore, in the realities of the capitalist system, and not in the banal philistine fantasies of English parsons, or of the German “Marxist”, Kautsky, “inter-imperialist” or “ultra-imperialist” alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or of a general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a “truce” in periods between wars. Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars, and in their turn grow out of wars; the one conditions the other, producing alternating forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle on one and the same basis of imperialist connections and relations within world economics and world politics. But in order to pacify the workers and reconcile them with the social-chauvinists who have deserted to the side of the bourgeoisie, over-wise Kautsky separates one link of a single chain from another, separates the present peaceful (and ultra-imperialist, nay, ultra-ultra-imperialist) alliance of all the powers for the “pacification” of China (remember the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion[13]) from the non-peaceful conflict of tomorrow, which will prepare the ground for another “peaceful” general alliance for the partition, say, of Turkey, on the day after tomorrow, etc., etc. Instead of showing the living connection between periods of imperialist peace and periods of imperialist war, Kautsky presents the workers with a lifeless abstraction in order to reconcile them to their lifeless leaders. sincere and politically honest only if he fights against the annexation of Korea by Japan, and urges freedom for Korea to secede from Japan?

AT: Capitalism Good—Democracy

Democracy mediated by capital is nothing more than the underside of totalitarianism - it justifies violence and exclusion - straight turns the internal link.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, "Rebespierre of the Divine Violence of Terror," Lacan.com, 2007, accessed 1/20/10 http://www.lacan.com/zizrobes.htm

The Orwellian proposition "democracy is terror" is thus democracy's "infinite judgment," its highest speculative identity. This dimension gets lost in Claude Lefort's notion of democracy as involving the empty place of power, the constitutive gap between the place of power and the contingent agents who, for a limited period, can occupy that place. Paradoxically, the underlying premise of democracy is thus not only that there is no political agent which has a "natural" right to power, but, much more radically, that "people" themselves, the ultimate source of the sovereign power in democracy, doesn't exist as a substantial entity. In the Kantian way, the democratic notion of "people" is a negative concept, a concept whose function is merely to designate a certain limit: it prohibits any determinate agent to rule with full sovereignty. (The only moment when "people exists" are the democratic elections, which are precisely the moment of the disintegration of the entire social edifice - in elections, "people" are reduced to a mechanical collection of individuals.) The claim that people does exist is the basic axiom of "totalitarianism," and the mistake of "totalitarianism" is strictly homologous to the Kantian misuse ("paralogism") of political reason: "the People exists" through a determinate political agent which acts as if it directly embodies (not only re-presents) the People, its true Will (the totalitarian Party and its Leader), i.e., in the terms of transcendental critique, as a direct phenomenal embodiment of the noumenal People... The obvious link between this notion of democracy and Lacan's notion of the inconsistency of the big Other was elaborated by Jacques-Alain Miller, among others: Is 'democracy' a master-signifier? Without any doubt. It is the master-signifier which says that there is no master-signifier, at least not a master-signifier which would stand alone, that every master-signifier has to insert itself wisely among others. Democracy is Lacan's big S of the barred A, which says: I am the signifier of the fact that Other has a hole, or that it doesn't exist. [[21]](http://www.lacan.com/zizrobes.htm" \l "_ftn21" \o ") Of course, Miller is aware that EVERY master-signifier bears witness to the fact that there is no master-signifier, no Other of the Other, that there is a lack in the Other, etc. - the very gap between S1 and S2 occurs because of this lack (as with God in Spinoza, the Master-Signifier by definition fills in the gap in the series of "ordinary" signifiers). The difference is that, with democracy, this lack is directly inscribed into the social edifice, it is institutionalized in a set of procedures and regulations - no wonder, then, that Miller approvingly quotes Marcel Gauchet about how, in democracy, truth only offers itself "in division and decomposition" (and one cannot but note with irony how Stalin and Mao made the same claim, although with a "totalitarian" twist: in politics, truth only emerges through ruthless divisions of class struggle...). It is easy to note how, from within this Kantian horizon of democracy, the "terrorist" aspect of democracy - the violent egalitarian imposition of those who are "surnumerary," the "part of no part" - can only appear as its "totalitarian" distortion, i.e., how, within this horizon, the line that separates the authentic democratic explosion of revolutionary terror from the "totalitarian" Party-State regime (or, to put it in reactionary terms, the line that separates the "mob rule of the dispossessed" from the Party-State brutal oppression of the "mob") is obliterated.

AT: Capitalism Good—Growth

Only the elimination of capitalism makes sustainable growth possible

Istvan Meszaros, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and Professor Emeritus at U. Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy,” Monthly Review, 2007 http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm

The nightmare of the "stationary state" remains a nightmare even if one tries to alleviate it, as John Stuart Mill proposed, through the illusory remedy of "better distribution" taken in isolation.  There can be no such thing as "better distribution" without a radical restructuring of the production process itself.  The socialist hegemonic alternative to the rule of capital requires fundamentally overcoming the truncated dialectic in the vital interrelationship of production, distribution, and consumption.  For without that, the socialist aim of turning work into "life's prime want" is inconceivable.  To quote Marx: In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly -- only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs![15](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm" \l "_edn15" \t "_blank) These are the overall targets of socialist transformation, providing the compass of the journey and simultaneously also the measure of the achievements accomplished (or failed to be accomplished) on the way.  Within such a vision of the hegemonic alternative to capital's social reproductive order there can be no room at all for anything like "the stationary state," nor for any of the false alternatives associated with or derived from it."  The all-round development of the individuals," consciously exercising the full resources of their disposable time, within the framework of the new social metabolic control oriented toward the production of "co-operative wealth," is meant to provide the basis of a qualitatively different accountancy: the necessary socialist accountancy, defined by human need and diametrically opposed to fetishistic quantification and to the concomitant unavoidable waste. This is why the vital importance of growth of a sustainable kind can be recognized and successfully managed in the alternative social metabolic framework.  Such an alternative order of social metabolic control would be one where the antithesis between mental and physical labor -- always vital for maintaining the absolute domination over labor by capital as the usurper of the role of the controlling historical subject -- must vanish for good.  Consequently, consciously pursued productivity itself can be elevated to a qualitatively higher level, without any danger of uncontrollable waste, bringing forth genuine -- and not narrowly profit-oriented material -- wealth of which the "rich social individuals" (Marx), as autonomous historical subjects (and rich precisely in that sense) are fully in control.

AT: Capitalism Good—Economy (1/2)

Economic crisis is rooted in the capitalist drive for growth

Wage Slave News, 2009 (Wage Slave News, World Socialism, “The Economic Crisis: Will Capitalism Fail?” July 22, 2011, http://www.worldsocialism.org/canada/economic.crisis.will.capitalism.fail.20090824.htm)

Despite the recent pronouncement by the governor of The Bank of Canada that the recession is over, we are suffering through the worst crisis in capitalism since the 1930s Depression. Even he had to admit that the employment figures might not recover until 2014. So for the over seven million North Americans who have lost their jobs in this recession, the recession is definitely not over. The Toronto jobless rate was recently pegged at 9.6% and 15% for the 18-24 age group. These figures are even worse as they are shamelessly manipulated and ‘seasonally adjusted’ to reflect only a fraction of the real rate. For example, those who have given up looking for jobs, those in part-time jobs who want full time, and those who are underemployed and take temporary jobs until something better comes along, are not counted. Unfortunately, the job of the modern-day economist is to be a cheerleader for the capitalist system and put a happy face on the bleak outlook that capitalism offers. Recently, an ‘economist’ interviewed on CBC radio, explained the continued rise in unemployment as a good sign because it meant that more people must be looking for a job and that is a sign of their confidence in an improving economy! Today, however, the TSE dropped a gut-wrenching 316 points, wiping out much of the recent gain that gave rise to optimism. Oprah reported that 10 000 American families per day were losing their homes to repossession. The houses sit empty because the stock of unsold houses is so high. Thus we have millions of families who have to live with friends or relatives, or, worse, in tent cities because they have no home, and millions of homes standing empty waiting for tenants. It’s all part of the madness of a system that can only produce for those with the money to pay for their commodities and to hell with those who can’t. The financial meltdown triggered by the sub-prime mortgage fiasco is the greatest financial disaster since 1929. Venerated financial houses, such as Lehman Brothers, that have been solid for decades and with assets in the hundreds of billions came tumbling down or required billions in federal money to stay afloat. And, of course, the collapse of General Motors, the cadillac of corporations, is something no one would have predicted just a short time ago. Every recession is a crisis in the capitalist mode of production. Marx wrote that capitalist production moves through certain periodic cycles. It moves through a state of quiescence, growing animation, prosperity, overtrade, crisis, and stagnation - what is referred to today as ‘the business cycle’. The manifestation of a recession is an oversupply of goods to the market that cannot be sold immediately, sending a signal to the production units to slow down or stop production and thus creating unemployment. The production units reduce orders for the means of production, raw materials and machinery, which causes more lay-offs and the unemployed reduce their purchases, creating a snowball rolling down a hill effect. But what causes the overproduction? Marxist scholars such as Rudolph Hilferding and Mikhail Tugan-Baranovsky pointed to the anarchy of capitalist production as the culprit and scientific socialists developed this idea. For steady sustained growth, capitalist production needs a state of equilibrium between the various sectors of the economy and between supply and demand. The absence of social regulation means that this is rarely achieved and only for short periods of time. Production is based on the expectation of profit and profit is highest in a boom period. Then the drive for maximum profits sees production lines ramped up and new ones created. No one wants to miss out on the bonanza and no one expects to be the one who can’t sell his commodities. Eventually, of course, all this expansion means that productive capacity goes beyond what the market can absorb and productive capital is tied up in the form of unsold goods. Profits drop and capital turns over slower or is withdrawn altogether. In addition, the reserve army (that part of the work force that is often unemployed or on welfare and kept around only to be activated in times of expanded production) disappears in a boom so that demand for labour increases, raising its price and reducing profitability and depleting the investment fund of the capitalists. This results in a lower demand for producer goods, i.e. natural resources, machines, etc. producing a crisis in that sector. Thus the anarchy of production, the loss of equilibrium between sectors, and rising wages, create the climate for recession. Once the recession is upon us, conditions that are favourable to a recovery become apparent. Companies that declare bankruptcy sell off their assets cheaply to their rivals. Less demand for producer goods means lower prices.

<card continues>
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The reserve army and many others are laid off creating a competition for jobs and thus lowering wages. Lower demand for loans reduces interest rates like any other commodity. The large stocks built up before the advent of the recession gradually decline to a point where production is again necessary. All of these factors make investing in production more attractive and the cycle begins its upward swing. It is evident then that the seeds of every boom are to be found in every recession and, conversely, the seeds of every recession are to be found in every boom. This boom and bust cycle is an entirely natural occurrence of the capitalist mode of production. It hasn’t collapsed capitalism yet, and, in fact, recessions tend to strengthen the system by weeding out the weak and inefficient enterprises, something not apparent in the state-run capitalism of the Soviet Union, contributing to its demise. Collapse theories developed in the latter part of the nineteenth century, in part as a response to the Long Depression, 1873 to 1895. Several leading theoreticians and leaders of left organizations presented collapse scenarios. Karl Kautsky said that capitalism is incapable of prolonged survival because of the inability of markets to keep pace with production. Henry Hyndman, of the Social Democratic Federation, thought that the depression would bring an attempt to substitute collective for capitalist control, i.e. a social revolution. Engels wrote that while productive power increases in geometric ratio, markets increase in an arithmetic one. Rosa Luxembourg, Kautsky, and Bogdanov based collapse theories on the restricted purchasing power of the working class. This underconsumption theory argued that aggregate demand, i.e. workers’ consumption fund plus capitalists’ consumption fund could not buy the total product, especially when the capitalists used some of their fund for reinvestment thus reducing the total available for buying products. Luxembourg theorized that the extra product, not bought by the workers or the capitalists, was disposed of in those parts of the world not yet under the capitalist mode of production. Since the tendency of capitalism is to expand and spread, then that market would shrink until the extra product could not be sold putting capitalism into a crisis from which it could never recover. The companion parties of the World Socialist Movement argued that total aggregate demand consists of workers’ consumption plus capitalists’ consumption plus capitalists’ investments because those investments were not lost but used to buy the means of production – raw materials, machinery, buildings etc. In addition, since the exchange value of a commodity is determined by the amount of socially necessary labour embedded in it, then a value equal to that must be shared between the workers and the capitalists, i.e. the total purchasing power is equal to the total sum of values. Even though value and price may vary (according to the supply and demand of the market) the sum total of values equals the sum total of prices. Thus the workers and the capitalists together would be able to buy all the products on the market. If underconsumption were true, then it would have stifled the growth of capitalism completely. A second collapse theory centered around the falling rate of profit due to the rising rate of the organic composition of capital. Capital invested is divided into two parts. Constant capital is that part that buys the raw materials and producer goods such as machinery and is transferred directly through the productive process to the finished product. Variable capital is used to buy labour-power that produces surplus value (that value created by the worker over and above his wage) that is embedded in the commodity and realized at its sale. That is the only source of profit. As technology and machinery develop, more of the invested capital goes into the constant part and less into buying labour-power, more into dead labour (machinery) and less into living labour. Thus the part producing surplus-value shrinks and with it the rate of profit. However, so far, the fall in the rate of profit has been very slow and often not apparent at all. Marx noted that this falling rate is only a tendency, not a law, and is offset by many other factors such as shift work, increased use of the machinery, ( increases the rate of exploitation), cheapening of the elements of constant capital (cheap goods that don’t last long), higher productivity, including higher intensity of work, and the increased rate of the turnover of capital. Thus, it is unlikely that the rise in the organic composition of capital will bring about collapse of the system. The real evidence is that capitalism has continued and continues to expand despite regular crises and doesn’t look like collapsing any time soon. Whether other factors such as the end of an oil-based economy or global warming will have a major effect on the health of capitalism remains to be seen What we can say for sure is that : A recession is a normal consequence of capitalism, A recession can invigorate capitalism, Capitalism is not likely to collapse of its own accord any time soon, If collapse theories were true, all socialists would need to do is sit back and do nothing, If capitalism did collapse, it wouldn’t necessarily mean that socialism would follow, Socialism is the task of the working class and can only come about by the actions of a conscious majority understanding and wanting socialism, Thus we must assume capitalism will continue and work towards its demise, Collapse theories therefore undermine the real work of socialists, just as do time and energy spent on reforms and alternative systems within capitalism such as cooperatives, fair trade, and communes.
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Capitalist economies = epic fail

Grey 2008 (Barry Grey, Writer for World Socialist Web Site, wsws.org, “The Wall Street crisis and the failure of American capitalism*,”* Published by the International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI), July 23, 2011, <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2008/sep2008/lehm-s16.shtml>)

The end of Lehman Brothers and Merrill Lynch, two of the largest Wall Street investment banks, one week after the government takeover of the mortgage finance giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, marks a new stage in the convulsive crisis of American capitalism. On Monday, global markets fell sharply in a sign of mounting panic and doubt over the stability of the entire US banking system. Throughout Europe stock markets plunged by as much as 4 percent. The fall on Wall Street was even steeper, with the Dow Jones Industrial Average losing 504 points, or 4.42 percent. There is every indication that the sell-off will intensify, with the full implications of the collapse of the two Wall Street banks as yet far from clear. The immediate concern is the fate of American International Group (AIG), the world’s largest insurance company, and Washington Mutual, the largest savings and loan bank in the US, both of which are teetering on bankruptcy. The sudden demise of Lehman Brothers and Merrill Lynch has removed a huge amount of liquidity from the economy, as paper values built up over decades of speculation come crashing down. This is capital that is needed to finance business operations, and its elimination will inevitably depress economic activity, fueling unemployment and recession, further undermining home prices and consumer spending, and further weakening the balance sheets of already financially shaken banks. A sea change is unfolding in the US and world economy that portends a catastrophe of dimensions not seen since the Great Depression of the 1930s. The fall of icons of American capitalism such as 158-year-old Lehman Brothers and 94-year-old Merrill Lynch can only lead to the further discrediting of the “free market” ideology of the US ruling elite, as well as its political and economic system. The spectacle of giants of capitalism drowning in debt piled up over decades of reckless speculation must inevitably discredit the social class—the American capitalist class—which is responsible for the debacle. The bromides that have been uttered by the official spokesmen for the government, the media, Wall Street and the political parties over the past year of mounting financial crisis have lost all credibility. The assurances that the latest government bailout will stabilize the situation, that the US banking system is “fundamentally sound,” that the housing and credit markets are about to “turn the corner,” etc., reassure no one. On Monday, Preident Bush mouthed such phrases in a brief White House appearance. Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson at a White House press conference evaded questions about who was responsible for the financial disaster and instead declared that he was “focused on the future.” The presidential candidates, Republican John McCain and Democrat Barack Obama, made perfunctory statements that were remarkable only for their brevity and vacuity. What is widely acknowledged, even in ruling class circles, as the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression is unfolding in the midst of a presidential election. But it barely rates a mention by either the Republican or Democratic candidate. Both parties and their candidates tip toe around a financial scandal of world historic proportions because they are equally implicated. They are both bound hand and foot to Wall Street and single-mindedly dedicated to the defense of American capitalism. McCain issued a statement demanding “reform” in Washington and on Wall Street and pledging to bring “accountability” to Wall Street. This from a multi-millionaire whose campaign is being run by a bevy of lobbyists for Wall Street and other sections of big business. His Democratic counterpart, Barack Obama, issued a predictably mealy-mouthed statement complaining that “too many folks in Washington and on Wall Street weren’t minding the store.” While attempting to pin the blame for the crisis entirely on the Bush administration—ignoring the “free market,” deregulatory policies of Democrats Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton—he offered a mutual amnesty between himself and McCain, saying, “I certainly don’t fault Senator McCain for these problems...” These events are signposts in the historic failure of American and world capitalism. For the working class, they mean a rapid growth of unemployment, poverty, homelessness and social misery. The government, Wall Street and both political parties will seek to place the burden for the consequences of their own greed and incompetence squarely on the backs of working people. The collapse is devastating ever wider layers of the population, including those who have worked on Wall Street and received some of the financial benefits of the speculative boom. Some 26,000 Lehman employees are not only out of a job, with few prospects of finding similar employment elsewhere, but as owners of 25 percent of the company’s stock they have lost a combined $10 billion, wiping out their savings and retirement funds. Tens of thousands of employees at Merrill Lynch and Bank of America will lose their jobs in the merger of the two firms, adding to the 110,000 jobs slashed in the US financial services industry over the past year. The broader implications of the mounting financial crisis were signaled by Hewlett-Packard’s announcement Monday that it was cutting 25,000 jobs. Many of those who precipitated this economic disaster, on the other hand, will profit handsomely from the debris they have left behind. Hedge funds and other short-sellers, who bet on the collapse of corporations, are even now speculating furiously on the demise of the remaining Wall Street firms, Morgan Stanley and Goldman Sachs, as well as big commercial banks such as Bank of America. William Gross of the nation’s largest bond fund, Pimco, took in $1.7 billion last week by betting on—and publicly agitating for—a government takeover of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The emergency talks over the weekend, involving the heads of the major commercial and investment banks and led by Treasury Secretary Paulson and top Federal Reserve officials, centered on rescuing Merrill Lynch and orchestrating an orderly liquidation of Lehman. Under pressure from Paulson and the Fed, Merrill agreed to sell itself to Bank of America, the largest consumer commercial bank in the US. At the same time, there were frantic negotiations over the fate of AIG, which faces bankruptcy unless it can raise tens of billions of dollars in capital.

<card continues>
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When US markets opened Monday, AIG was asking for emergency loans from the Fed to stave off collapse. A failure of AIG threatens to bring down the entire credit system both in the US and internationally, because the company holds a large stake in the multi-trillion-dollar, unregulated market in so-called “credit default swaps.” AIG has sold CDS contracts to banks, hedge funds and big investors all over the world, under which it guarantees the mortgage-backed debt of a wide range of companies in the event that they default. If AIG should go under, the value of the debt which it insures would fall to an unknown level, destabilizing the credit markets and threatening a chain reaction of defaults and bankruptcies. The events of the past two weeks demonstrate that the American financial aristocracy is plunging the entire country into bankruptcy. These events are themselves climatic moments in a protracted process. For three decades, the “free market” has been elevated to the status of a secular religion in the US, with the capitalist market as its god and socialism as its devil. This period, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, has seen the wholesale dismantling of the productive base of the US economy, at the cost of millions of jobs and the living standards of the American working class. In the name of the supposed infallibility of the market, the operations of big business have been deregulated, removing all legal restraints on corporate profit-making and fueling the accumulation of ever more obscene levels of wealth in the hands of a financial oligarchy. A vast process of social plunder has occurred, in which the wealth of the country has been redistributed from the bottom to the very top. The scrapping of huge sections of industry and the immense growth of social inequality are the hallmarks of the historic decline of American capitalism. At the heart of this decay is the separation of the process of personal enrichment of the ruling elite from the material process of production. The United States has become the world leader not in manufacturing technology or industrial power, but in financial speculation and parasitism. As Floyd Norris, the economics columnist of the New York Times, put it on Friday, “During recent years, Lehman—along with many competitors—went on a borrowing binge to buy assets with as little money down as possible.” By its very nature, the parasitism of American capitalism has generated corruption and criminality on an unprecedented scale. Wall Street CEOs have awarded themselves tens of millions and even billions in compensation, in an utterly irrational and socially destructive squandering of social resources for the benefit of private greed. At the end of 2007, for example, the Lehman board awarded CEO Richard S. Fuld a compensation package worth more than $40 million. According to Reda Associates, he can expect to collect $63.3 million if he is terminated. In 2004, he paid $13.75 million for an ocean-front home in Jupiter Island, Florida, adding to his other properties, including a home in Sun Valley, Idaho. Joe Gregory, a former president of Lehman, used to travel to work in a helicopter. He recently put his 9,500-square-foot ocean-front home in Bridgehampton, New York on the market for $32.5 million. The Financial Times recently reported that compensation for major executives of the seven largest US banks totaled $95 billion over the past three years, even as the banks recorded $500 billion in losses. The question of precisely who and what is to blame for the greatest economic disaster in more than three quarters of a century is something that will not and cannot be raised by any section of the political or media establishment. Since the eruption of the current crisis, there have no been serious congressional hearings, no public investigations, no attempt to hold anyone accountable. Massive government interventions into the supposedly sacrosanct precincts of the “free market,” for the purpose of bailing out giant Wall Street firms, including the biggest government takeover of corporate entities in US history, have been carried out without any public debate or significant opposition from either political party. This, while millions of Americans are losing their homes and their jobs as a result of predatory corporate practices! Certain conclusions must be drawn from the crisis of the American economic and political system. There is no solution within the framework of the profit system. What is needed is a socialist program that places the needs of the people before the profits and personal fortunes of the ruling elite. The entire financial system must be taken out of private hands and nationalized in the form of a public utility under the democratic control of the working class, with provisions taken to safeguard the holdings of small depositors and share-holders. It must be subordinated to the social needs of the people and dedicated to developing and expanding the productive forces in order to eliminate poverty and unemployment and vastly improve the living standards and cultural level of the entire population. Those who are responsible for the economic catastrophe must be called to account. Criminal investigations should be undertaken with appropriate sanctions for those who have plundered the social wealth. A full public accounting should be made of the hundreds of billions that have been diverted to private bank accounts through fraud and criminality. Such gains should be seized and used for the public good. The only social force that can carry this out is the working class. It requires a clean break with the Democratic Party and the two-party system and the mobilization of the immense social power of the working class in its own party, on the basis of a revolutionary socialist program. This is the program fought for by the Socialist Equality Party.

AT: Capitalism Good—Transition Wars

Capitalism will continually appeal to fear of economic crisis to justify its existence - these fears rely on a logic of capital that is epistemologically disabling and self-fulfilling

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana and Codirector of the Center for Humanities at Birkbeck College, "Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism," New Left Review, No. 224, 1997, pp.25-27

Today, financial crisis is a permanent state of things the reference to which legitimizes the demands to cut social spending, health care, support of culture and scientific research, in short, the dismantling of the welfare state. Is, however, this permanent crisis really an objective feature of our socio-economic life? Is it not rather one of the effects of the shift of balance in the ‘class struggle’ towards Capital, resulting from the growing role of new technologies as well as from the direct internationalization of Capital and the co- dependent diminished role of the Nation-State which was further able to impose certain minimal requirements and limitations to exploitation? In other words, the crisis is an ‘objective fact’ if and only if one accepts in advance as an unquestionable premise the inherent logic of Capital—as more and more left-wing or liberal parties have done. We are thus witnessing the uncanny spectacle of social-democratic parties which came to power with the between-the-lines message to Capital ‘we will do the necessary job for you in an even more efficient and painless way than the conservatives’. The problem, of course, is that, in today’s global socio-political circumstances, it is practically impossible effectively to call into question the logic of Capital: even a modest social-democratic attempt to redistribute wealth beyond the limit acceptable to the Capital ‘effectively’ leads to economic crisis, inflation, a fall in revenues and so on. Nevertheless, one should always bear in mind how the connection between ‘cause’ (rising social expenditure) and ‘effect’ (economic crisis) is not a direct objective causal one: it is always-already embedded in a situation of social antagonism and struggle. The fact that, if one does not obey the limits set by Capital, a crisis ‘really follows’, in no way ‘proves’ that the necessity of these limits is an objective necessity of economic life. It should rather be conceived as a proof of the privileged position Capital holds in the economic and political struggle, as in the situation where a stronger partner threatens that if you do X, you will be punished by Y, and then, upon your doing X, Y effectively ensues.

Alt Solvency: General

Articulating specific failures within the plan and the status quo is the only way to exceed epistemological blind spots and generate new methods of emancipation.

William K Carroll, “Crisis, movements, counter-hegemony: in search of the new,” Interface, Vol. 2, Issue 2, 2010, accessible at <http://www.khukuritheory.net/do-the-beginnings-of-revolutionary-change-exist-today/>

In the most general terms and at the highest level of abstraction, the question of counter-hegemony evokes the dialectic of bringing the new into existence, against the sedimented practices and relations that, as Marx (1852) wrote, weigh ‘like a nightmare on the brains of the living.’ Yet it is from existing practices and relations that the new is fabricated, which is to say that the future is already contained as potential within the present. ‘Fermenting in the process of the real itself’ is what Ernst Bloch called ‘the concrete forward dream: anticipating elements are a component of reality itself’ (1986:197). Counter-hegemony, as distinct from defensive forms of subaltern resistance, strives to shape those ‘anticipating elements’, so that they may become lasting features of social life. For counter-hegemony, the challenge is to seek out in the present the preconditions for a post-capitalist future and to develop political strategy based on an analysis of those immanent possibilities (Ollman 2003). Gramsci captured this dialectic with the metaphor of welding the present to the future: How can the present be welded to the future, so that while satisfying the urgent necessities of the one we may work effectively to create and ‘anticipate’ the other (1977: 65)? The new is no mere ‘fashion’, the latter being a preferred trope of modernity (Blumer 1969), closely integrated with consumer-capitalist accumulation strategies, and thus with reproducing the status quo. Often the new reworks the old, with radical effects. Viewed dialectically, the new preserves yet transforms extant reality, as in the incorporation of indigenous ways as alternatives to neoliberal practices that have grown decidedly old (cf. Bahn 2009). This dialectic between what already exists and what might be constructed out of that is integral to any project of purposeful socio-political change. Movements, as Melucci (1989) has emphasized, are laboratories for social invention. They are carriers of the ‘new means and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships’ that Williams (1977: 123) identified with cultural emergence; ‘emergent publics’ that create possibilities for a more democratic way of life (Angus 2001). Movements succeed in creating change when political and cultural opportunity structures open up (Tarrow 1998). But which movements, which practices and which alignments of movements and practices, in short which ‘new combinations’ (Dyer-Witheford 2001) might already carry the new – and under what contemporary conditions might they have efficacy? These are more concrete questions of counter-hegemony. Theorists of agency and structure note that, although social structures are sustained solely through the practices that reproduce them, such practices, precisely because they are structurally reproductive, do not produce much that is new; only transformative practices have that capacity (Bhaskar 1989; Fraser 1995). Indeed, a well-established hegemonic structure naturalizes social cleavages and contradictions, securing the active, agentic consent of subalterns to their subordination (De Leon, Desai and Tuğal 2009: 216; Joseph 2002).

Alt Solvency: Withdrawal (1/2)

We must withdraw from capitalist relations - universal rejection is key to producing sustainable social relations and solving the impacts

James Herod, author and social activist, "The Strategy described abstractly," Getting Free, 2004, accessed 1/28/10 http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t imply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed.

<card continues>

Alt Solvency: Withdrawal (2/2)

<card continued>

This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction. The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. The long term goal of communists, anarchists, and socialists has always been to restore community. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. The long term goals have always been clear: to abolish wage-slavery, to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

Alt Solvency: Starting Point

Only starting from a position of anti-capitalism solves

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg. 127-128.

Virno does recognize the danger that a politics predicated upon Exodus, by downgrading the “absolute enmity” implicit in the traditional Marxist assumption that class struggle in its revolutionary form issues in civil war, leads to the assumption that one is “swimming with the current” or is be­ing driven “irresistibly forward” (1996, 203). A politics aimed at the estab­lishment of liberated zones within capitalism under the assumption that the state will wither away without actually being “smashed” leads to the problematic one sees over and over again in postmodern cultural studies: “doing what comes naturally” as radical praxis. To counter this, Virno re­defines the “unlimitedly reactive” “enmity” of the “Multitude” in terms of the “right to resistance” (206): What deserve to be defended at all costs are the works of “friendship.” Vio­lence is not geared to visions of some hypothetical tomorrow, but functions to ensure respect and a continued existence for things that were mapped out yesterday. It does not innovate, but acts to prolong things that are already there: the autonomous expressions of “acting-in-concert” that arise out of general intellect, organisms of non-representative democracy, forms of mu­tual protection and assistance (welfare, in short) that have emerged outside of and against the realm of State Administration. In other words, what we have here is a violence that is conservational (206). The decisiveness of the question of absolute enmity becomes clear if we ask a rather obvious question: What distinguishes autonomous expres­sions from any privatized space (say, Internet chat rooms) that withdraws from the common in the name of friendships, mutual aid, or, for that mat­ter, networks, gated communities, or whatever? In short, nothing can lead more directly to the death of revolutionary politics than the assumption that the days of absolute enmity are over. Autonomous expressions neces­sarily lead to the esoteric and the singular as the paths of least resistance. Therefore (as in all Left-Nietzscheanisms), they take as their main enemy the programmatic and the decidable, transforming liberation into a pri­vate, simulacral affair, regardless of their denunciations of capitalism. I will return to this issue in the next two chapters, but I want to conclude this discussion by stressing that only theory and action that establish spaces that bring the common out into the open—before an outside (theory and judgment) so as to make visible the concentrated political-economic force of the ruling class—can count as a genuinely “new” politics.

Alt Solvency: Space Exploration (1/2)

The plan will never successfully colonize space as long as it is motivated by capitalist self-preservation and imperial expansion—only radical political action like the alternative offers hope for collective social betterment which solves space exploration better.

International Communist Current (ICC), “Apollo 11 and the lunar landing: the adventure that wasn’t,” International Communist Current Online, 25 October 2009, <http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2009/10/apollo-11-lunar-landing>

Nonetheless, it would be simplistic to see only the hypocrisy. The lunar expedition was also a colossal risk: a project of such cost, such complexity, and such novelty had never been undertaken before. The very fact that it was undertaken at all was also the expression of the American ruling class' remarkable confidence in its own abilities - a self-confidence which had been totally lost by the old powers, bled white after two world wars and losing ground economically and militarily. The United States, on the contrary, seemed to be at the height of their powers: they had suffered no bombardment of their home territory, and had emerged from the Second World War as the only undisputed victor, with an unequalled military power and apparently in the midst of an economic boom whose prosperity remained an object of admiration and envy for other countries. In the USA, the ruling ideology had, so to speak, lagged behind reality and it continued to express the self-confidence of a triumphant bourgeoisie which would have been more appropriate to the 19th century, before the bloodbath of 1914-18 demonstrated that the capitalist class was henceforth an obstacle to the future progress of the human species. In 1962, Kennedy proposed to send a man to the moon in ten years. In the end, it was only seven years later that Apollo 11 touched down on the moon. But far from marking the beginning of a new triumphant era of expansion into space, in the image of the expansion to the West in the 19th century, the lunar programme's success marked the moment when capitalism's decadence caught up with the American Dream. The country was bogged down in the Vietnam War, Kennedy had been assassinated, and the first signs of the economic crisis were beginning to appear - the USA would abandon the gold standard in 1971, bringing to an end the Bretton Woods system which had guaranteed the international financial system's stability since World War II. America's space programme suffered the same fate as its declining economy, military invincibility, and ideological self-confidence. The objective fixed by Reagan for the 1980s was no longer exploration but the "Star Wars" programme: the out and out militarisation of orbital space. The ambition to develop cheaper and more effective means to send men and equipment into space thanks to the space shuttle, came to nothing: today the shuttle is thirty years old and the USA is itself dependent on equally aging Russian rockets to supply the International Space Station (ISS). In 2004,George W. Bush announced a new "vision" for space exploration, with the completion of the ISS and the launch of a new moon mission in 2020 in order to prepare later missions to Mars. But as soon as one looks a little closer, it is obvious that this is nothing but a bluff. The cost of an expedition to Mars would be truly astronomical, and at a time when the US government is sinking billions in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is nothing to show where it will find the necessary funds for the NASA. And although Obama is presented as a new Kennedy - young, dynamic, and a bearer of hope - it is obvious that he has not, and cannot have, Kennedy's ambition. The United States are no longer the triumphant power of forty years ago, but a giant with feet of clay, increasingly contested by second or even third-rate powers. Even the plans for manned lunar flights are more and more under attack within the Obama administration, let alone manned flights to Mars.[10] There will be no "new space era": the great powers are on the contrary engaged in a race to militarise near space with spy satellites, and no doubt soon with laser-armed anti-missile satellites; Low Earth Orbit is becoming an enormous scrap heap of obsolete satellites and abandoned rockets. World capitalism is a moribund society which has lost its ambition and its self-confidence, and the great powers think of space only in terms of protecting their own petty interests on Earth.

<card continues>

Alt Solvency: Space Exploration (2/2)

<card continued>

Can we reach the stars? Of all the human species' exploits, the greatest is certainly that undertaken by our distant ancestors 100,000 years ago, when they left humanity's cradle in the Rift Valley to populate first the African continent, then the rest of the world. We will never know what qualities of courage and curiosity, of knowledge and openness towards the new, our predecessors called on as they set out to discover a new world. This great adventure was that of a primitive communist society (or rather a proliferation of such societies). We cannot say whether humanity will one day be capable of leaving Earth and travelling to other planets, or even other stars, but this much is certain: such an exploit will only be carried out by a communist society which no longer pours gigantic resources in war, which has repaired the damage done to the planet by capitalist anarchy, which has put an end to the terrible waste of its youth's physical and mental energy in poverty and unemployment, which undertakes exploration and scientific research for the good of mankind and the joy of learning, and which will be able to look to the future with confidence and enthusiasm.

Alt Solvency: Space Exploration

If space technology can be socially beneficial, the method through which we conceptualize exploration must be informed by an agenda premised on a rejection of inequality. Only this can make space a terrain of emancipation.

Peter Dickens, “The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?” Monthly Review, Vol. 62, Issue 6, November 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Most obviously, the technology allowing a human presence in the cosmos would be focused mainly on earthly society. There are many serious crises down here on Earth that have urgent priority when considering the humanization of outer space. First, there is the obvious fact of social inequalities and resources. Is $2 billion and upwards to help the private sector find new forms of space vehicles really a priority for public funding, especially at a time when relative social inequalities and environmental conditions are rapidly worsening? The military-industrial complex might well benefit, but it hardly represents society as a whole. This is not to say, however, that public spending on space should be stopped. Rather, it should be addressed toward ameliorating the many crises that face global society. Satellites, for example, have helped open up phone and Internet communications for marginalized people, especially those not yet connected by cable. Satellites, including satellites manufactured by capitalist companies, can also be useful for monitoring climate change and other forms of environmental crisis such as deforestation and imminent hurricanes. They have proved useful in coordinating humanitarian efforts after natural disasters. Satellites have even been commissioned by the United Nations to track the progress of refugees in Africa and elsewhere

So outer space technology can be used for tackling a number of immediate social and political issues. But these strategies do not add up to a philosophy toward outer space and the form humanization should take. Here again, the focus should be on the development of humanity as a whole, rather than sectional interests. First, outer space, its exploration and colonization, should be in the service of some general public good. Toward this end, the original intentions of the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty should be restored. Outer space should not be owned or controlled by any economic, social, and political vested interest. The cosmos should not, in other words, be treated as an extension of the global environment, one to be owned and exploited. We have seen enough of this attitude and its outcomes to know what the result would be. Spreading private ownership to outer space would only reproduce social and environmental crises on a cosmic scale.

The Ancient Greek philosopher Diogenes (412-323 BCE) was once asked where he came from. “I am a citizen of the Cosmos,” he replied. All of us are, and should consider ourselves citizens of the cosmos. It belongs to all of us. But this does not necessarily mean our physical presence in the cosmos and travelling vast distances into the solar system, often creating formidable hazards. It means much more: creating an understanding of the cosmos and our place within it. The cosmos is important for human identity. Knowledge of the cosmos can provide humanity with at least provisional answers to some fundamental questions. How did we get here? What is humanity’s place in the cosmos? How is the structure of the universe developing? Is there life elsewhere? In what ways are humans, and other entities, part of the cosmos? What cosmic processes can we actually observe on an everyday basis?

AT: Cap Inevitable

History is not over. We represent the global majority who are oppressed by capital. The failure of revolutionary politics is not a historical necessity—we can still win

John Murphy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Miami, Manuel Caro Associate Professor of Sociology at Barry University, and Jung Min Choi, Professor of Sociology at San Diego State Universty, “Globalization With A Human Face,” 2004 p2-3

What is diabolical is that the market is touted to hold everyone’s future. Because persons no longer direct history, but are simply products of this process, there appears to be no alternative to the spread of markets and their worldwide integration. And anyone who chooses another approach to conceptualizing order—an alternative social or economic logic—is simply obstinate and denying reality. The logic of the market is deemed irrefutable. Furthermore, the image that is emanating from most political leaders in Europe and North America is that utopian thought is passé. The days of what Marcuse called the “Great Refusal” are long past.4 For many observers, history has delivered the best of possible worlds—an economic windfall to select groups that will eventually enhance everyone. What persons need now are patience and perseverance, and the magic of the market will do the rest. But many groups are becoming restless. In their opinion, the ideology of the market has become stale and an impediment to achieving a better life. Stated simply, they have not abandoned their utopian ideals of fairness and justice, and are looking for ways to realize these aims. In some cases, revolutionary fervor persists. But in general, they have decided to challenge the inherent ability of history to deliver a more propitious future. They are saying “enough,” and are searching for alternative models of economic regulation and social order. As a result, large numbers of persons have been protesting in most major cities over the spread and costs of neoliberalism. Although most mainstream politicians have been deaf to these calls for a more responsible order, the chants for a new direction continue. And contrary to the claims made by many pundits, these protesters have not abandoned their utopian impulse and have decided to make a different history. In other words, they have recognized that only ideology can bring history to an end, and that the recent picture created by this political device is an illusion. They have understood, accordingly, that history ends only when no more persons are left to decide their own fate. The invitation extended to join the globalized world is thus considered by many to be a ruse to get persons to jettison their own perspectives on the future. To prosper, all they have to do is assimilate to specific political mandates that have been cloaked in historical necessity. But critics of globalization have decided to change the rules of history and defy this view of progress. Their refusal, however, will not necessarily destroy civilization, as some conservative critics claim, but merely expose how the newly globalized world has been rigged in favor of the rich and ignores the needs and desires of most persons. The powerful and their supporters scream that these challenges are irrational and doomed to fail. Without a doubt, if these powerful forces continue to meddle in the social experiments of others, defeats will likely occur. But these failures have nothing to do with flaunting the laws of history or human nature. They occur most often because the rich and powerful want to discredit alternatives **to their worldview and thus undermine any threats to their social or economic privileges.**

AT: No Specific Alt

Demands for concrete alternatives fail – our criticism opens the intellectual spaces necessary to produce new alternatives to capitalism that we haven’t come towards yet – articulating limits through the K is key.

Andrew Kliman, Professor in the Department of Economics at Pace University, “Alternatives to Capitalism: What Happens After the Revolution?” 5 September 2004, accessed 4/20/10 http://thecommune.wordpress.com/2010/01/08/alternatives-to-capitalism-what-happens-after-the-revolution/

Neglect is not the only reason why revolutionaries have failed to concretize the vision of the new society. Many have opposed and continue to oppose this perspective on the ground that we should not draw up “blueprints for the future.” And many invoke Marx’s name on behalf of this position. It is true that he rejected such blueprints, but precisely what was he rejecting, and why? Talk of “blueprints” is often careless. It is important to recall that Marx was grappling with some honest-to-goodness blueprints of a future society. Fourier, for instance, stipulated how large each community (Phalanx) will be, how it will be laid out, how people will dine and with whom they will sit, and who will do the dirty work (a legion of “youngsters aged nine to sixteen, composed of one-third girls, two-thirds boys”). There is a great chasm between such blueprints, which Marx rejected, and what Dunayevskaya, in her final presentation on the dialectics of organization and philosophy, called “a general view of where we’re headed.” As Olga’s report suggests, the difference is not essentially a matter of the degree of generality, but a matter of the self-development of the idea. Dunayevskaya wrote that once Capital was finished and Marx was faced with the Gotha Program in 1875, “There [was] no way now, now matter how Marx kept from trying to give any blueprints for the future, not to develop a general view of where we’re headed for the day after the conquest of power, the day after we have rid ourselves of the birthmarks of capitalism” (PON, p. 5). Nor did Marx remain silent about this issue until that moment. For instance, in this year’s classes on “Alternatives to Capitalism,” we read the following statement in his 1847 Poverty of Philosophy (POP). “In a future society, in which … there will no longer be any classes, use will no longer be determined by the minimum time of production, but the time of production devoted to different articles will be determined by the degree of their social utility.” Even more important than Marx’s explicit statements about the new society is the overall thrust of his critique of political economy. Although it is true that he devoted his theoretical energy to “the critical analysis of the actual facts, instead of writing recipes … for the cook-shops of the future” (Postface to 2nd ed. of Capital), critique as he practiced it was not mere negative social criticism. It was a road toward the positive. He helped clarify what capital is and how it operates, and he showed that leftist alternatives will fail if they challenge only the system’s outward manifestations rather than capital itself. By doing this, he helped to clarify what the new society must not and cannot be like – which is already to tell us a good deal about what it must and will be like. “All negation is determination” (Marx, draft of Vol. II of Capital). I believe that there are two reasons why Marx rejected blueprints for the future. As this year’s classes emphasized, one reason is that he regarded the utopian socialists’ schemes as not “utopian” enough. They were sanitized and idealized versions of existing capitalism: “the determination of value by labor time – the formula M. Proudhon gives us as the regenerating formula of the future – is therefore merely the scientific expression of the economic relations of present-day society” (Marx, POP, Ch. 1, sect. 2). But this simply means that Marx rejected a particular kind of attempt to concretize the vision of the new society, not that he rejected the task itself. The other reason was that Marx, who aligned himself with the real movement of the masses, held the utopians’ schemes to be obsolete, or worse, once the working class was moving in another direction. I believe that this perspective remains valid, but that the subjective-objective situation has changed radically. Today, “what masses of people are hungering for[,] but which radical theoreticians and parties are doing little to address[, is] the projection of a comprehensive alternative to existing society,” as we stated in our 2003-04 Marxist-Humanist Perspectives thesis. Two months ago, Anne Jaclard spoke to a class of college youth. Many of them were eager for a concrete, well articulated vision of a liberatory alternative to capitalism, and they rejected the notion that its concretization should be put off to the future. Visitors to our classes, and participants in the “Alternatives to Capital” seminar on Capital in New York, have also demanded greater concreteness. How do we align with this real movement from below? Given the direction in which the masses’ thinking is moving, hasn’t resistance to concretizing a liberatory alternative become obsolete? I do not mean to imply that we should accommodate demands for easy answers. Like the Proudhonists and utopian socialists with whom Marx contended, many folks seem to think that concretizing an alternative to capitalism is simply a matter of articulating goals and then implementing them when the time comes. What we need to do when easy answers are demanded, I think, is convey the lessons we have learned – that the desirability of proposed alternatives means nothing if they give rise to unintended consequences that make them unsustainable, that political change flows from changes in the mode of production, and so forth – while also saying that which can be said about the new society, as concretely as it can be said.

AT: Cede the Political

Their argument that criticism of the system only paves the way for the new right should be rejected on-face – it’s a strategy designed to buy off resistance so that the liberal-democratic capitalist consensus can proceed intact.

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2002, Revolution at the Gates, p. 302

It is true that, today, it is the radical populist Right which usually breaks the (still) prevailing liberal-democratic consensus, gradually making accept­able hitherto excluded ideas (the partial justification of Fascism, the need to constrain abstract citizenship on grounds of ethnic identity, etc.). However, the hegemonic liberal democracy is using this fact to blackmail the Left radicals: “We shouldn’t play with fire: against the new Rightist onslaught, we should insist more than ever on the democratic consensus — any criticism of it, wittingly or unwittingly, helps the New Right!” This is the key line of separation: we should reject this blackmail, taking the risk of disturbing the liberal consensus, even up to questioning the very notion of democracy. The ultimate answer to the criticism that radical Left proposals are utopian should thus be that, today, the true utopia is the belief that the present liberal-democratic capitalist consensus can go on indefinitely, with­out radical change. We are therefore back with the old ‘68 slogan “So yons realistes, demandons l’impossible!”: in order to be a true “realist”, we must consider breaking out of the constraints of what appears “possible” (or, as we usually put it, “feasible”).

AT: Gibson-Graham

Gibson Graham’s theory increases exploitation of women and workers and increases the power of oppressive people and structures

Julie Torrant, PhD Candidate in political theory at SUNY, 2003 [“Family Labor: Caring for Capitalism” [www.geocities.com/redtheory/redcritique/FallWinter2003/familylabor](http://www.geocities.com/redtheory/redcritique/FallWinter2003/familylabor)]

In contrast to Lenin's layered understanding of women's emancipation, by denying the subordination of family labor to productive (for-profit) labor, Gibson-Graham contest this Marxist theory of the oppression of women, denying that the movement of women into the wage-labor force and breaking down the gender division of labor is a necessary condition for the emancipation of women. This understanding of emancipation does not even recognize what Lenin called the "first step" in women's emancipation, putting them on equal footing with men, much less recognize the second step of abolishing wage-labor entirely. Rather, all that is necessary, from this view, to emancipate women is to "recognize" (in culture) their labor as "productive". In other words, Gibson-Graham do not go beyond the formal freedoms of "inclusion", that Lenin critiques. In a particularly telling moment, Gibson-Graham argue that "[s]uch a politics [as they are advocating] might not be concerned to eradicate all or even specifically capitalist forms of exploitation but might instead be focused on transforming the extent, type, and conditions of exploitation in particular settings, or on changing its emotional components or its social effects" (53). Gibson-Graham, in other words, are all for exploitation. What becomes clear is that they are most concerned with the pragmatic accommodation of exploitation: making sure its effects are not so visible in order to help conceal its causes. For Gibson-Graham, if a woman no longer feels exploited, this is enough of an intervention into the social. However, whether the woman who makes minimum wage feels exploited or not, she is exploited and a change in feeling will not enable her to pay for quality daycare. By implying that such interventions as changes in the emotional component of exploitation are sufficient, Gibson-Graham serve those who benefit from for-profit relations and deny the material needs of workers.

Gibson-Graham’s argument makes no sense, destroys attempts to strategically essentialize capitalism, and makes no effort to re-frame the struggle. Prefer the alternative.

N. Castree, Professor of Geography, 1999 [Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, June 1999]

Capitalism (as we knew it) arguably suffers from serious epistemological, ontological and theoretical problems. The epistemological problems are threefold. First, while Gibson-Graham is right to stress the performativity of representation, she hades towards what Bhaskar (1989, 127) calls the ‘epistemic fallacy’, in which knowledge and the world are conflated. Secondly, this links to a distinct and paradoxical reticence to make truth claims about the world. This reticence arguably stems from the dual theoretical inspiration for Gibson-Graham’s ideas – Resnick and Wolff’s ‘overdeterminist Marxism’ and Derridean deconstruction – both of which, in very different ways, see knowledge as non-mimetic. This reticence is paradoxical, since Gibson-Graham does, of course, argue for an economic ‘reality’ in which capitalism and class look quite different to how we previously saw them. Thirdly, all this neglects that fact that, in certain circumstances, making strong claims to ‘truth’ is strategically and practically necessary and important. These epistemological issues feed into several ontological complaints about Gibson-Graham’s position. First, after Resnick andWolff (1987), she is right that capitalism does not exist in isolation but is ‘overdetermined’ by all other elements of social life.21 However, this fact does not preclude attempts to specify theoretically the ‘essential’ characteristics of capitalism and class even though, in practice, they do not exist in a ‘pure’ state (Albritton 1993). Second, in the absence of such specification, social analysis declines into a flabby pluralism or explanatory ‘everythingism’. Third, in this respect Gibson-Graham’s charter for a small c capitalism and a pluralized class category, while appealing, is much too general and inchoate to be serviceable as an explanatory political economic analysis. This leads, finally, to the main theoretical – and arguably most worrying – problem with The end of capitalism. In her concern to deconstruct Marxism, Capitalism and Class, we are left with no effort of reconstruction beyond the otherwise important point that all three miss out a great deal. What, if anything, can usefully be salvaged from Marx’s political economy – with its categories of use and exchange value, concrete and abstract labour, labour power and surplus value – remains a mystery. Though I quite appreciate that the intent of The end of capitalism is not to rebuild Marxism, I would suggest that leaving things at the level of deconstruction is nonetheless unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the validity of parts of Gibson- Graham’s critique, Marx’s abstract account of capitalism does not necessarily feature in an overblown vision of an no-longer-credible totality. There are other alternatives.22

AT: Gibson-Graham

Their argument fails to take into account how capitalism has posited its own presuppositions as an attempt to universalize and totalize itself.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2000, Contingency, Hegemony, Universality, p. 225-27

In much the same way, is not Derrida’s ‘metaphysics of presence silently dominated/hegemonized by Husserl’s subjectivity as the pure auto-affection/self-presence of the conscious subject, so that when Derrida talks about ‘metaphysics of presence’, he is always essentially referring to the Husserlian subject present-to-itself? The problem with sweeping philosophical oppositions (all the others against me and possi­bly my predecessors) therefore lies in the problematic totalization of all other options under one and the same global label – the multitude thus totalized is always secretly ‘hegemonized’ by one of its particular species~ in the same way, the Derridan notion of the ‘metaphysics of presence’ is secretly hegemonized by Husserl, so that Derrida in effect reads Plato and all the others through Husserl. And it is my contention that the same goes for the critical notion of ‘essentialism’. Let us take the case of cap­italism itself: against the proponents of the critique of global capitalism, of the ‘logic of Capital’, Laclau argues that capitalism is an inconsistent composite of heterogeneous features which were combined as the result of a contingent historical constellation, not a homogeneous Totality obeying a common underlying Logic. My answer to this is the reference to the Hegelian logic of the retroac­tive reversal of contingency into necessity: of course capitalism emerged from a contingent combination of historical conditions; of course it gave birth to a series of phenomena (political democracy concern for human rights, etc.) which can be ‘resignified’, rehegemonized, inscribed into a non-capitalist context. However, capitalism retroactively ‘posited its own presuppositions’, and reinscribed its contingent/external circumstances into an all-encompassing logic that can be generated from an elementary conceptual matrix (the ‘contradiction’ involved in the act of commodity exchange, etc.). In a proper dialectical analysis, the ‘necessity’ of a total­ity does not preclude its contingent origins and the heterogeneous nature of its constituents — these are, precisely its presuppositions which are then posited, retroactively totalized, by the emergence of dialectical total­ity. Furthermore, I am tempted to claim that Laclau’s critique would have been much more appropriate with regard to the very notion of ‘rad­ical democracy’, to which Laclau and Mouffe regularly refer in the singular does this notion not actually cover a series of heterogeneous phe­nomena for which it is problematic to claim that they belong to the same genus: from the feminist, ecological, etc. struggle in developed countries to the Third World resistance to the neoliberal New World Order?

AT: Permutation

Doesn’t solve—failure to reject capital completely makes nuclear war inevitable

James Herod, World-Renowned Anarchist. Fourth Edition, January 2004. “Getting Free: A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it.” http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm

But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

It’s already too late, we need to strike out at the enemy even in the times when the enemy can be of use to us.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2004. Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle, p. 83-84

There is a will to accomplish the ‘leap of faith’ and step outside the global circuit at work here, a will which was expressed in an extreme and terrifying manner in a well-known incident from the Vietnam War: after the US Army occupied a local village, their doctors vaccinated the children on the left arm in order to demonstrate their humanitarian care; when, the day after, the village was retaken by the Vietcong, they cut off the left arms of all the vaccinated children. .. . Although it is difficult to sustain as a literal model to follow, this complete rejection of the enemy precisely in its caring ‘humanitarian’ aspect, no matter what the cost, has to be endorsed in its basic intention. In a similar way, when Sendero Luminoso took over a village, they did not focus on killing the soldiers or policemen stationed there, but more on the UN or US agricultural consultants or health workers trying to help the local peasants after lecturing them for hours, and then forcing them to confess their complicity with imperialism pub­licly, they shot them. Brutal as this procedure was, it was rooted in an acute insight: they, not the police or the army, were the true danger, the enemy at its most perfidious, since they were ‘lying in the guise of truth’ — the more they were ‘innocent’ (they ‘really’ tried to help the peasants), the more they served as a tool of the USA. It is only such a blow against the enemy at [their]his best, at the point where the enemy ‘indeed helps us’, that displays true revolutionary autonomy and ‘sovereignty (to use this term in its Bataillean sense). If one adopts the attitude of ‘let us take from the enemy what is good, and reject or even fight against what is bad’, one is already caught in the liberal trap of ‘humanitarian aid’.

FW: Class First

Class comes first - labor divisions are the primary determinant of social change. Our alt is a prerequisite to all the 1AC advantages.

Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, "What is Orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever," Red Critique, Spring 2001, accessed 1/3/10 http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice.

FW: Method 1st

Method comes first. Our understandings of the ways in which society is constructed and how that affects our political imagination is a prerequisite to action or critique

Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, "What is Orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever," Red Critique, Spring 2001, accessed 1/3/10 http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

AT: Policy FW (1/2)

Aff framework arguments are a radically conservative attempt to preserve capital through the violent exclusion of otherness. Your argument is question begging—if we win your ideology or metaphysics is bad then your framework is already implicated by our kritik. Seriously, saying that it’s a good idea to *not* question is idiotic

Istvan Meszaros, Chair of philosophy @ U. of Sussex, The Power of Ideology, 1989 p. 232-234

Nowhere is the myth of ideological neutrality – the self-proclaimed *Wertfeihert* or value neutrality of so-called ‘rigorous social science’ – stronger than in the field of methodology. Indeed, we are often presented with the claim that the adoption of the advocated methodological framework would automatically exempt one from all controversy about values, since they are systematically excluded (or suitably ‘bracketed out’) by the scientifically adequate method itself, thereby saving one from unnecessary complication and securing the desired objectivity and uncontestable outcome. Claims and procedures of this kind are, of course, extremely problematical. For they circularly *assume* that their enthusiasm for the virtues of ‘methodological neutrality’ is bound to yield ‘value neutral’ solutions with regard to highly contested issues, without first examining the all-important question as to the conditions of *possibility* – or otherwise – of the postulated systematic neutrality at the plane of methodology itself. The unchallengeable validity of the recommended procedure is supposed to be *self-evident* on account of its *purely methodological* character. In reality, of course, this approach to methodology is heavily loaded with a conservative ideological substance. Since, however, the plane of *methodology* (and ‘meta-theory’) is said to be *in principle* separated from that of the *substantive* issues, the methodological circle can be conveniently closed. Whereupon the mere insistence on the purely methodological character of the criteria laid down is supposed to establish the claim according to which the approach in question is neutral because everybody can adopt it as the common frame of reference of ‘rational discourse’. Yet, curiously enough, the proposed methodological tenets are so defined that vast areas of vital social concern are a priori excluded from this rational discourse as ‘metaphysical’, ‘ideological’, etc. The effect of circumscribing in this way the scope of the one and only admissible approach is that it automatically disqualifies, in the name of *methodology* itself, all those who do not fit into the stipulated framework of discourse. As a result, the propounders of the ‘right method’ are spared the difficulties that go with acknowledging the real divisions and incompatibilities as they necessarily arise from the contending social interests at the roots of alternative approaches and the rival sets of values associated with them. This is where we can see more clearly the social orientation implicit in the whole procedure. For – far from offering an adequate scope for critical enquiry – the advocated general adoption of the allegedly neutral methodological framework is equivalent, in fact, to consenting not even to raise the issues that really matter. Instead, the stipulated ‘common’ methodological procedure succeeds in transforming the enterprise of ‘rational discourse’ into the dubious practice of producing *methodology for the sake of methodology*: a tendency more pronounced in the twentieth century than ever before. This practice consists in sharpening the recommended methodological knife until nothing but the bare handle is left, at which point a new knife is adopted for the same purpose. For the ideal methodological knife is not meant for cutting, only for sharpening, thereby interposing itself between the critical intent and the real objects of criticism which it can obliterate for as long as the pseudo-critical activity of knife-sharpening for its own sake continues to be pursued. And that happens to be precisely its inherent ideological purpose. **6.1.2** Naturally, to speak of a ‘common’ methodological framework in which one can resolve the problems of a society torn by irreconcilable social interest and ensuing antagonistic confrontations is delusory, at best, notwithstanding all talk about ‘ideal communication communities’. But to define the methodological tenets of all rational discourse by way of transubstantiating into ‘ideal types’ (or by putting into methodological ‘brackets’) the discussion of contending social values reveals the ideological colour as well as the extreme fallaciousness of the claimed rationality. For such treatment of the major areas of conflict, under a great variety of forms – from the Viennes version of ‘logical positivism’ to Wittgenstein’s famous ladder that must be ‘thrown away’ at the point of confronting the question of values, and from the advocacy of the Popperian principle of ‘little by little’ to the ‘emotivist’ theory of value – inevitably always favours the established order. And it does so by declaring the fundamental structural parameters of the given society ‘out of bounds’ to the potential contestants, on the authority of the ideally ‘common’ methodology. However, even on a cursory inspection of the issues at stake it ought to be fairly obvious that to consent not to question the fundamental structural framework of the established order is radically different according to whether one does so as the beneficiary of that order or from the standpoint of those who find themselves at the receiving end, exploited and oppressed by the overall determinations (and not just by some limited and more or less easily corrigible detail) of that order. Consequently, to establish the ‘common’ identity of the two, opposed sides of a structurally safeguarded hierarchical order – by means of the reduction of the people who belong to the contending social forces into fictitious ‘rational interlocutors’, extracted from their divided real world and transplanted into a beneficially shared universe of ideal discourse – would be nothing short of a methodological miracle.

<card continues>

AT: Policy FW (2/2)

<card continued>

Contrary to the wishful thinking hypostatized as a timeless and socially unspecified rational communality, the elementary condition of a truly rational discourse would be to acknowledge the legitimacy of contesting the given order of society in substantive terms. This would imply the articulation of the relevant problems not on the plan of self-referential theory and methodology, but as inherently practical issues whose conditions of solution point towards the necessity of radical structural changes. In other words, it would require the explicit rejection of all fiction of methodological and meta-theoretical neutrality. But, of course, this would be far too much to expect precisely because the society in which we live is a deeply divided society. This is why through the dichotomies of ‘fact and value’, ‘theory and practice’, ‘formal and substantive rationality’, etc., the conflict-transcending methodological miracle is constantly stipulated as the necessary regulative framework of ‘rational discourse’ in the humanities and social sciences, in the interest of the *ruling ideology*. What makes this approach particularly difficult to challenge is that its value-commitments are mediated by methodological precepts to such a degree that it is virtually impossible to bring them into the focus of the discussion without openly contesting the framework as a whole. For the conservative sets of values at the roots of such orientation remain several steps removed from the ostensible subject of dispute as defined in logico/methodological, formal/structural, and semantic/analytical terms. And who would suspect of ideological bias the impeccable – methodologically sanctioned – credentials of ‘procedural rules’, ‘models’ and ‘paradigms’? Once, though, such rules and paradigms are adopted as the common frame of reference of what may or may not be allowed to be considered the legitimate subject of debate, everything that enters into the accepted parameters is necessarily constrained not only by the scope of the overall framework, but simultaneously also by the inexplicit ideological assumptions on the basis of which the methodological principles themselves were in the first place constituted. This is why the allegedly ‘non-ideological’ ideologies which so successfully conceal and exercise their apologetic function in the guise of neutral methodology are doubly mystifying. Twentieth-century currents of thought are dominated by approaches that tend to articulate the social interests and values of the ruling order through complicated – at time completely bewildering – mediations, on the methodological plane. Thus, more than ever before, the task of ideological demystification is inseparable from the investigation of the complex dialectical interrelationship between methods and values which no social theory or philosophy can escape.

AFF—Cap Good: War

Capitalism is key to preventing war - empirically proven

Griswold '5

Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” Cato Institute, 29 December 2005, accessed 11/29/08 http://www.freetrade.org/node/282

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

AFF—Cap Good: Space

Cap is key to space - only the private sector can generate the venture capital needed to get off the rock

Britt '1

Robert Roy Britt, "The Top 3 Reasons to Colonize Space," 8 October 2001, accessed 2/4/10 http://www.space.com/missionlaunches/colonize\_why\_011008-4.html

But ultimately, many scientists say, finding signs of life on Mars might require human missions. The gargantuan cost of sending people to Mars, however, has prevented any firm plans from taking shape. Meanwhile, many space enthusiasts have given up hope that NASA will get us there. They think the economics of human space flight will be driven by capitalism rather than science. Sid Goldstein thinks any effort to get a Kmart on Mars should also help cure social, environmental and economic woes back home. Yet he worries that if some decisions aren't made quickly to put humans permanently in space, we may never go. "I believe that humans living independently in space will be achievable in 10 to 15 years, but only if we are serious," Goldstein says. And he's got some ideas about how to get serious. In his book, "You Can Make It So: How To Cure Our Environmental, Economic, And Crime Problems," Goldstein analyzes the long-term health of the economy and the environment. He argues that investments in space colonization will never be made without a massive commitment and tremendous cooperation between government, industry and the people. If we rely on the government to put us into space, Goldstein says, expect delays, cost overruns, and ultimate failure. Instead, he recommends economic incentives to encourage the private sector to rapidly develop the technologies needed for long-distance space travel and colony survival. The investments would be designed to benefit the economy and the environment back home, as well. Among his proposals are $300 billion in federal funding over 10 years to construct the transportation and manufacturing infrastructure to develop energy and raw materials in space. The money could fund research to advance solar power technology, the study of asteroids and how to mine them for minerals and construction materials, and even scientific bases on the Mo

AFF—Cap Good: Space

The free market is uniquely key to space - socialist approaches to space are inefficient and ineffective

Murphy '5

Robert Murphy, PhD in economics from NY, "A Free Market in Space," The Free Market, Vol. 26 No. 1, January 2005, accessed 2/4/10 http://mises.org/freemarket\_detail.aspx?control=525

On October 4, 2004, the privately funded SpaceShip-One climbed to an altitude of over 70 miles, clinching the $10 million "X Prize." Many analysts were excited by the prospects for commercial space travel, and the day when orbital or even interplanetary flights would be affordable for the average person. As if to rebut the naysayers who dismissed SpaceShipOne as a mere tourist attraction for millionaires, Las Vegas hotel magnate Robert Bigelow capitalized on the event by announcing a $50 million prize for the first team to put a privately funded space station into orbit. Beyond the obvious implications for sci-fi buffs and other space enthusiasts, the episode sheds light on the versatility of free enterprise. Most obvious, we see that the government is not necessary for space exploration; engineers and pilots do not suddenly become smarter when they are hired by NASA. Indeed, because a free market in space industries would be open to all competitors, we have every reason to expect technological innovation to be much quicker than in a monopolized space program. In a free market, the maverick pioneer just needs to convince one or a few capitalists (out of thousands) to finance his revolutionary project, and then the results will speak for themselves. In contrast, an innovative civil servant at NASA needs to convince his direct superiors before trying anything new. If his bosses happen to dislike the idea, that’s the end of it. Prior to the exploits of SpaceShipOne, the standard justification for government involvement in space was that such undertakings were "too expensive" for the private sector. But what does this really mean? The Apollo moon program certainly didn’t create labor and other resources out of thin air. On the contrary, the scientists, unskilled workers, steel, fuel, computers, etc. that went into NASA in the 1960s were all diverted from other industries and potential uses. The government spent billions of dollars putting Neil Armstrong on the moon, and consequently the American taxpayers had billions fewer dollars to spend on other goods and services. This is just another example of what Frédéric Bastiat described in his famous essay, "That Which Is Seen, and That Which Is Not Seen." Whenever the government creates some public work, everyone can see the obvious benefits. For example, everyone can appreciate the fact that we put a US flag on the moon, and listened as Neil Armstrong apparently flubbed his memorized line. Or to use a more mundane example, everyone can see a beautiful new sports stadium financed (in part) by tax dollars. What people can’t see are the thousands of other goods and services that now won’t be enjoyed, because the scarce resources necessary for their production were devoted to the government project. Politicians may break moral laws, but they can’t evade economic ones: If they send a man to the moon (or build a new stadium), consumers necessarily must curtail their enjoyments of other goods. Thus the question becomes: Was the Apollo program (or new stadium) sufficiently valued by consumers to outweigh its opportunity cost (i.e., the value consumers place on the goods that now cannot be produced)? At first glance, this seems to be a difficult question to answer. After all, how can we possibly compare the benefits of the Apollo program with, say, the benefits of the additional shoes, diapers, automobiles, research on cancer, etc. that could have been alternatively produced? The short answer is, we can’t. This is just a specific example of the more general principle elaborated by Ludwig von Mises: the impossibility of economic calculation under socialism. Even if a central planning board were truly benevolent, and even if it had access to all of the technical conditions (such as resource supplies and technological recipes) of the economy, the planners would be at a loss to deploy the scarce resources in an efficient way. There would be no way to determine whether the chosen output goals were good ones, or whether an alternative plan could have provided the subjects with a better outcome. The above analysis might puzzle the reader. Yes, it is certainly difficult in practice to tell whether the Apollo program (or any other government project) is worth its cost, but isn’t that true of any undertaking? Why should this be a unique drawback for government endeavors? The crucial difference is that private projects are subject to the profit and loss test. The owner of a private firm must pay market prices for all of his or her scarce resources. If the consumers do not then voluntarily spend enough money on the final product or service to recoup these expenditures, this is the market’s signal that the resources are more urgently needed in other lines (according to the consumers). It can never be the case that all entrepreneurs find a particular resource "too expensive" to use; if no entrepreneurs were buying it, then the price of this resource would fall until some did. For example, it would be unprofitable—"wasteful"—to use gold in the construction of bridges; the extra money motorists would pay to drive across a golden bridge would not cover the additional expense. Yet it is profitable to use gold in the construction of necklaces or rings. Consumers are willing to pay enough for golden necklaces (versus silver or copper ones) that it makes it worthwhile for jewelers to buy gold for this purpose. Hence, the high price of gold is (among other things) a signal to engineers not to use gold in building bridges, because consumers would rather the scarce metal be used in jewelry. The principle is the same when it comes to space travel. The reason private entrepreneurs would never have financed the moon program in the 1960s is that the financial returns from such a project wouldn’t come close to covering the expenses. Yet this is just the market’s way to tell these entrepreneurs that the computers, scientists’ labor, fuel, etc. would be better devoted to other ends. By seizing tax dollars and financing the Apollo program, President Kennedy et al. simply forced Americans to forgo the thousands of products that, according to their own spending decisions, they would have preferred to the space adventures. Is this perspective crude materialism? Surely, there are all sorts of things that are not profitable in the narrow sense, and yet are of tremendous importance to Bigelow’s $50 million prize. The private sector’s promotion of abstract knowledge (as opposed to practical, marketable discoveries) is nowhere better demonstrated than in the Clay Mathematics Institute’s million dollar awards for the solution to any of seven important problems. Historically, there were many rich patrons of the arts and science; didn’t the Vatican pay Michelangelo not only to create beautiful art but also to increase donations? Indeed, it is a common misconception that in the free market, "the highest bidder" determines things. No, in a free market, the owner determines the use of a piece of property. When a man lets his teenage son take the car for the night, is he renting it to the highest bidder? Of course not. A system of property rights, and the freely floating prices that accompany the exchange of these rights, is necessary to ensure the best possible use of resources. This is true in something as mundane as car production, or something as exotic as trips to Mars. The private sector can finance safe and efficient space exploration, but it will only do so in projects where the benefits (including donations from enthusiasts) truly outweigh the costs. The success of SpaceShipOne illustrates these facts. Now that the public has seen the potential of private space flight, perhaps it will become politically possible to axe NASA and return its budget to the private sector.

AFF—Cap Good: Transition Wars

US transition from capitalism guts global stability - this causes economic collapse, global starvation and poverty, loss of hegemony, and nuclear war

J.R. Nyquist, renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations and WorldNetDaily contributing editor, "The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash," Financial Sense, 4 February 2005, accessed 2/4/10 http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, “We drank the poison and now we must die.”

AFF—AT: Cap = Root Cause

Capitalism isn't the root cause of war - the neg confuses the direction of causality

Joshua S. Goldstein, professor of International Relations at American University, War and Gender: How Gender shapes the War System and Vice Versa, 2002, p. 412

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice”. Then if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influences wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.  So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression/” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

AFF—AT: Cap Unsustainable

No risk of collapse in the status quo - capitalism is sustainable

Lewis '94

Martin Lewis, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism, 1994, pp. 10-11

While the global economy certainly cannot grow indefinitely in volume by pouring out an ever mounting cavalcade of consumer disposables, it can continue to expand in value by producing better goods and services ever more efficiently. As I shall argue repeatedly throughout this work, economic growth of this type is absolutely essential. Only a strongly expanding economic base can generate the capital necessary to retool our economy into one that does not consume the earth in feeding itself. Ecological sanity will be expensive, and if we cannot pay the price we may well perish. This proposition is even more vital in regard to the Third World; only steady economic expansion can break the linkages so often found in poor nations between rural desperation and land degradation. Genuine development, in turn, requires both certain forms of industrialization as well as participation in the global economy.

AFF—No Solvency: General

Alt fails – counter-revolution and capitalist backlash overwhelms

Andrew Kliman, Professor in the Department of Economics at Pace University, “Not by Politics Alone,” Presentation for panel on “Thinking Through a Post-Capitalist Future” at Left Forum Conference, 2 April 2006, accessed 4/21/10 http://akliman.squarespace.com/writings/not%20by%20politics%20alone%204.2.06.doc

There are several different issues that I’m thinking of when I use the term “sustainable.” One is that it is hard to imagine that a break with capitalism will emerge throughout the world all at once. This presents a very serious problem of sustainability, since history has shown, I believe, that socialism in one country is indeed impossible. What can be done to defend the break with capitalism in the meantime, against both the inevitable attempt at counter-revolution and capitalism’s totalizing tendency, its tendency to swallow up and incorporate everything within itself? I do not know. I do not know anyone who knows. But I do know that this is a question that needs to be thought through with extreme care – and now. It cannot be put off until “after the revolution.” To assume that there will be time, at that point, to think it through or time to work it out through experimentation, is wishful thinking at best. It is quite hard to believe that there will be any time at all before the counter-revolution and the tentacles of the capitalist system go to work. In referring to “sustainability,” I also have several economic problems in mind that must be confronted. If the emergent new society does not “deliver the goods,” and if it does not move towards elimination of alienated labor and reduction of working time, there will be no popular mandate for it – and indeed, no reason for its continued existence. At this point, it could be kept alive only through force, through suppression of mass opposition, so it would turn into its opposite.

AFF—No Solvency: Cap Inevitable

Human greed makes capitalism inevitable

John K. Wilson, coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People, 2000, pp. 15- 16

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God.

Capitalism is inevitable – media, economic, and legal influences

John Isbister, professor of economics at University of California Santa Cruz, Capitalism and Justice, 2001, p. 46

Some in the capitalist world try to retain or re-create the best parts of precapitalism.  Some Amish and Mennonite communities are based on precapitalist values, as are some other faith-based groups.  The 1960s and 1970s saw the creation of secular alternative rural communes, communities whose members tried to eliminate all marks of distinction between them, to be self-sufficient, and to live simply. The communes had some successes, but most eventually collapsed.  Communities such as these have attempted to embody precapitalist values, but none has succeeded in cutting itself off from capitalist influences: from the market, from the media, from the legal system, and from other influences of the modern world.  While we can learn from our antecedent societies, we cannot return to them.  The door has been closed.

AFF—No Solvency: Specific Alt Key

They have to articulate an alternative system to capitalism – failure to specify means the alt is co-opted and ignored

John K. Wilson, coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People, 2000, pp. 110-113

Victory isn't easy for the left, even when it wins. One example in which progressives did almost everything right (but nevertheless was widely attacked) was the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) hearings in Seattle. Thanks to the hard work of leftists around the country (and the world), Seattle was overrun by more than 50,000 protesters who were determined to bring public attention to a powerful, secretive trade group. A huge rally organized by labor groups brought tens of thousands marching through Seattle, complete with union workers and environmentalists in sea turtle costumes. Thousands of protesters linked arms and prevented the opening session of the WTO from meeting. Most of the media coverage blamed the protesters for property damage that was planned and caused by anarchists and not stopped by the police. But the protesters did have a powerful effect on the scene, where the bias of the American media was less important to the delegates, many of whom sympathized with some of the protests. President Clinton, the world's leading trend detector, expressed his support for listening to the peaceful protesters, showing that he was more alert to the persuasive power of the anti-WTO forces than most of the media. Seattle and Washington left the left with many lessons. The first was never to let the media choose what the issue would be. Unfortunately, journalists (and their editors) are trained to overlook an important point for the sake of a flashy image and to portray a dramatic confrontation rather than a moral cause. This doesn't excuse the inaccurate reporting, biased attacks, and unquestioning defense of the authorities that filled most of the front pages and TV news about the WTO and IMF demonstrations. The progressives failed to spin the issue beyond their simple anti-WTO message. The reasons for opposing the WTO got some mention, but the idea of an alternative international organization built on genuine "free trade" and the protection of basic human rights never was aired. The left has become so accustomed to being ignored that progressives have wisely refined the attention-grabbing techniques of theatrical protest that can convey a simple message. Unfortunately, the left hasn't developed the difficult techniques of bringing more complex arguments into the public debate, and the result is that progressive views seem shallow and emotional compared with the more extensive coverage of the ideas of the right and the center in the mainstream media. Still, Seattle was both a success and an opportunity lost. The left brought attention to an organization without many redeeming values, but it never was able to launch a serious debate about what the alternative global values should be. Ignoring the massive evidence of police misconduct and brutality, the media served a well-defined role as gatekeepers of the truth. When the media criticized Seattle officials, it was for “permitting” the peaceful protestors to exercise their right to protest instead of shutting down the city, as happened for the rest of the WTO meetings. Still, the inability of the left to unify their ideas as easily as they unified behind the physical protest made it possible for many of the media errors to go unchallenged. Imagine if all the groups united behind the WTO protests had planned to meet after the initial melee and formulated a united response. Imagine if they had declared, We denounce all violence, whether it is the violence of smashing windows; the violence of shooting tear gas, concussion grenades, pepper spray, and rubber bullets at peaceful protestors; or the violence of regimes anywhere in the world where political, human, or labor rights are violated and the environment is harmed. We regret that the police chose to ignore the vandalism on the streets of downtown Seattle and instead attacked nonviolent protestors with tear gas and rubber bullets. As we informed police before the protests began, a group of violent anarchists had announced their intention to try to disrupt our nonviolent protests and discredit our cause. although many peaceful demonstrators defended Seattle’s stores—some of which we had previously protested in front of—against property damage and looting, we could no persuade these well-organized anarchists to stop, and we could not persuade the policy shooting tear gas at us to stop the violence. We remain united in our belief that the policies of the World Trade Organization are harmful to the people of the world and are designed instead to increase the profits of corporations and the politicians who serve them. We will return to downtown Seattle to exercise our constitutional rights to assemble peacefully and express our ideas about the WTO. Saying that the WTO should be abolished is a simply and perhaps desirable goal. But failing to present a comprehensive alternative to international trade left the protesters open to accusations of being naïve or protectionist. The problem for the left was that their efforts were so disorganized that no clear alternative emerged. There was no comprehensive solution offered for the problems posed by the WTO, the World Band, and the IMF. No alternative institutions were proposed to take over the work of helping the world rather than harming it. Progressives need an international approach to free trade that doesn’t seem like protectionism. “America First” is not a progressive perspective, and it fails to help the rest of the world. Without a progressive vision of globalism, the protests against free trade begin to merge with narrow-minded Buchananesque conspiracy theories about the UN or the WTO taking over the world.

AFF—Gibson-Graham

Totalized understandings and rejections of capitalism cause political cynicism and conservatism – the perm solves best

J.K. Gibson-Graham, the pen name of Katherine Gibson, Senior Fellow of Human Geography at Australian National University, and Julie Graham, professor of Geography at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1996, The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It), p. 263-64

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

AFF—Gibson-Graham

The best way to formulate anti-capitalism is to allow local resistance like the alt to coexist with global strategies like the plan – their alt can never solve alone

J.K. Gibson-Graham, the pen name of Katherine Gibson, Senior Fellow of Human Geography at Australian National University, and Julie Graham, professor of Geography at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2002, online: http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/rethink/rethinkp3.rtf, accessed January 9, 2005

Finally, what can we say about an economic politics outside the binary frame? In the face of the programs and plans of anti-globalization theorists and political analysts, our micropolitical experiments can easily be dismissed. Most analysts, like Hardt and Negri, offer a vision of an appropriate political response to globalization that is very distant from the one we are pursuing: Imperial corruption is already undermined by the productivity of bodies, by cooperation, and by the multitude’s designs on productivity. The only event that we are still awaiting is the construction, or rather the insurgence, of a powerful organization. The genetic chain is formed and established in ontology, the scaffolding is continuously constructed and renewed by the new cooperative productivity, and thus we await only the maturation of the political development of the posse. We do not have any models to offer this event. Only the multitude through its practical experimentation will offer models and determine when and how the possible becomes real. (2000: 411) We are no longer capable of waiting for the multitude to construct a powerful organization (Gibson-Graham, 1996). Instead, we continue to be inspired by feminism as a global force, one that started small and personal and largely stayed that way, that worked on cultivating new ways of being, that created new languages, discourses and representations, that built organizations, and that quickly (albeit unevenly) encompassed the globe. Globalization appears to call for one form of politics—mobilization and resistance on the global scale. But we believe there are other ways of practicing transformative politics—involving an opening to the local as a place of political creativity and innovation. To advocate local enactments is in no way to suggest that other avenues should close down. We would hope for the acceptance of multiple powers and forms of politics, with an eye to increasing freedoms and not limiting options. Rather than equivocating, with paradoxical certainty, about when and how a challenge to globalization will arise (the Hardt and Negri position), we have engaged in a here and now political experiment—working on ourselves and in our backyards.29 This is not because we think that we have found the only way forward, but because we have become unable to wait for an effective politics to be convened on some future terrain. The form of politics we are pursuing is not transmitted via a mass organization, but through a language and a set of practices. A language can become universal without being universalist. It can share the space of power with other languages, without having to eradicate or “overthrow” them.30 Academic, NGO, and internet networks can become part of a system of transmission, translation, amplification. In our (admittedly hopeful) vision, the language of the diverse economy and accompanying practices of non-capitalist development may have global purchase one day.